National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CONNECTING THE VOICES: COLLABORATION IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION

BY

WENDY MICHELE DOUGHTY ©

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1995

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-612-01683-8

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR:	Wendy Michele Doughty
TITLE OF THESIS:	Connecting the Voices: Collaboration in Community Education
DEGREE:	Ph.D.
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED:	1995

Permission is hereby granted to The University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all publication rights, and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided neither the thesis or any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Wendy M Doughty

8343-73 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T6C 0E1

Date: April 21/95

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled CONNECTING THE VOICES: COLLABORATION IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION submitted by WENDY MICHELE DOUGHTY in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in Educational Administration.

D MacKay
D.A. MacKay

Beth Young
B. Young

Tracey Derwing
T. M. Derwing

W. G. Maynes
W. G. Maynes

K L Ward
K. L. Ward

W. G. M.
T. J. Sork, External Examiner

Date: December 7, 1994

To the memory of my late father

George Homan Doughty

1919 - 1983

who taught me to pursue my dreams

and to never give up hope.

ABSTRACT

Connecting the Voices: Collaboration in Community Education examines the extent to which working collaboratively presents issues for consideration in program planning and implementation. It is a descriptive/analytic case study of the development and implementation of a program to prepare community-based heritage language instructors, in partnership with a non-profit organization, a community college and two government departments. The study chronicles a six year long effort to develop and implement this initiative within the context of continuous change. Interview data gathered from key stakeholders (13 learners, 5 instructors, 8 consultants, 4 advisory committee members, and 5 administrators) were supplemented by analysis of relevant documents and selected observations.

Themes derived from the data were presented in such a way as to explicate each of the stakeholder group's perceptions and experiences of the development and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. The data illustrate that the stakeholder groups held different opinions concerning factors and/or situations which influenced the development and implementation of the program, as well as the stakeholders they considered to be involved in the process. Divergent opinions were expressed concerning the forces, factors, processes and structures which influenced the ways in which the stakeholder groups worked together on this program.

The major finding of the study was that collaboration is a labor intensive process that requires personal commitment by stakeholders to the achievement of clearly articulated goals and outcomes which are continuously refined in response to emergent needs. Collaborative program development and implementation will be most effective if accountability and ownership are clearly defined by the stakeholders. Collaborative program initiatives benefit from humanistic leaders who can communicate effectively, and manage interpersonal conflict and multiple priorities. Above all, these leaders must maintain a sense of hope, passion, and vision for the collaborative venture.

The thesis concludes with the author's personal reflections on the consequences of this study for program design and implementation in the field of adult education. Researchers may find the methodology of this study interesting from the perspective that the researcher also acted as a program developer, instructor, and administrator over the course of the six years.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this thesis was due to the caring, commitment, and collaborative efforts of many people. The continuous cooperation of the stakeholders enabled this work to be completed. Their patience during the interviews, meetings, and reviewing of portions of this dissertation ensured that their voices were heard.

The study would not have been accomplished without the ongoing encouragement, guidance, and support of my thesis advisor, Dr. D.A. MacKay. He listened tirelessly as I explained yet another complication with the study and helped me to see the humor in all situations. He spent hours reviewing drafts, debating ideas, and was always open to my questions, regardless of their magnitude.

Dr. B. Young helped guide me through my struggles with the development of the proposal for this research. She listened to my muddled thoughts and helped provide a focus for my work. She constantly challenged me to reflect upon the research process and its effect upon my own being. Her insightful, scholarly comments served as a catalyst for me to include my voice in this work.

Dr. T. M. Derwing provided guidance concerning working with English as a Second Language learners and helped illuminate the significance of this research with respect to multiculturalism. She reviewed the work in great detail and provided comments which substantially shaped the final document. In her opinion, it was not enough that my voice be heard in this research; she

encouraged me to share my learning with other audiences.

The doctoral dissertation written by Dr. W. G. Maynes significantly influenced the manner in which I analyzed and presented the data from this study. Through his example, I developed an appreciation of the value of presenting the perspectives of the stakeholders within their own particular context.

It was a pleasure to have Dr. K. L. Ward as a committee member. Throughout the past ten years his encouragement, support and understanding have enabled me to meet challenges in both my academic and personal lives.

It was an honor to have such a respected scholar as Dr. T. J. Sork of the University of British Columbia as an external examiner. His considered review of the thesis contributed to a exhilarating and fulfilling final oral examination.

To all of these scholars I express my deepest gratitude. Through their efforts, I have grown as a practitioner, a scholar, and a person. They have helped me to rekindle my commitment and passion for my work in community education.

I also extend special thanks to Dr. Gene Krupa, my "critical friend" and my peer reviewers, Dr. Raymond Downie and Gloria Zbryski for their encouragement and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: RATIONALE, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Page

Introduction 1

Purpose of the Study 3

Significance of Study 4

Definition of Terms 5

Research Methodology 6

- Preliminary Investigation 7
- Pilot Study 8
- Case Study Design 9
- Data Collection Procedure 10
  - Interviews 11
    - Interview Method 11
    - Interview Procedure 12
    - Revisions to Interview Transcripts 17
  - Document Analysis 18
  - Participant Observation 19
  - Principles of Data Collection 20

Data Analysis Procedure 21

- Organizing the Data 22
- Generating Categories and Themes 23
- Communicating the Data 25

Standards of Rigor 27
  Construct Validity 27
  Internal Validity 27
  External Validity 28
  Reliability 29
Assumptions 29
Delimitations and Limitations 30
Organization of the Thesis 31

CHAPTER 2: RELATED LITERATURE

Defining Community and Community Education 32
Responding to Community Needs 35
Program Planning and Implementation in the Community 37
Involving Stakeholder Groups 38
Identifying Stakeholders 40
  Questions of Power 42
Values and Program Planning 43
Planning Models 45
Defining Collaboration 48
Process of Collaboration 50
Benefits of Collaboration 52
Costs of Collaboration 53
Collaborative Planning Skills 54
Summary 56

CHAPTER 3: CONNECTING THE VOICES 58

CHAPTER 4: PERSPECTIVES OF LEARNERS

- Background of Learners 102
- Definition of Heritage Language Education 103
- Use of Other Terms 104
- Heritage Language Education and Multiculturalism 105
- Importance of Context 106
  - Factors Influencing Program Implementation 106
    - Economic Context 106
    - Political Context 108
    - Social Context 109

Stakeholders in Heritage Language Instructor Training Program

- Department of Education 110
- Outcomes of the Program 113
  - Successful Aspects 113
    - Application of Learning 113
    - Communication Skills 115
    - Cultural Diversity 116
    - Knowledge of Canadian Education System 116
    - Peer Support 117
    - Self-Confidence 117
    - Sharing the Learning 118

        - Quality of Instructors 119
    - Aspects Requiring Improvement 119
        - Integration of Theory 120
        - Learner Workbook 120
        - Length of Courses 121
        - Scheduling of Courses 121
        - Variety in Instructors 123
- Future Directions for the Program 123
    - Accreditation of Program 123
    - Preparation of Community-Based Instructors 124
- Working Collaboratively 124
    - Factors Which Facilitate Collaboration 125
        - Process Factors 125
            - Acknowledgement 125
            - Allowing for Flexibility 126
        - Relationship Factors 126
            - Caring 126
            - Celebration 127
            - Enthusiasm 127
            - Equality 128
            - Personal Connections 128
- Summary 128

CHAPTER 5: PERSPECTIVES OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPERS & INSTRUCTORS

Background of Instructors 131

Definition of Heritage Language Education 132

Use of Other Terms 132

Heritage Language Education and Multiculturalism 133

Importance of Context 133

    Factors Influencing Program Development 134

    Factors Influencing Program Implementation 134

        Economic Context 134

        Research 135

        Social Context 135

Stakeholders in Heritage Language Instructor Training Program

    Advisory Committee 136

        Role Confusion 136

        Limitations Faced 137

        Maintaining Morale 138

    Community College 138

    LINGA 139

Outcomes of the Program 139

    Successful Aspects 140

        Application of Learning 140

        Cultural Diversity 141

            DACUM Process 142
            Empowerment 142
            Peer Support 143
            Self-Confidence and Self-Esteem 144
            Sharing Learning 145
        Aspects Requiring Improvement 145
            Delivery of Curriculum 146
            Feedback from Learners 147
            Integration of Theory 147
            Learner Workbook 148
            Recognition of Limited Resources 148
            Scheduling of Courses 148
            Sequencing of Courses 149
            Variety in Instructors 150
    Future Directions for Program 150
        Accreditation of Program 151
        Preparation of Community-Based Instructors 152
    Working Collaboratively 153
        Factors Which Facilitate Collaboration 153
            Relationship Factors 153
                Being Human 154
                Celebration 154
                Personal Connections 155

        Structural Factors 155
            Continuity of Instructors 155
            Definition of Ownership 156
            Supportive Infrastructure 157
    Factors Detrimental to Collaboration 157
        Process Factors 157
            Evolving Workloads 158
            Unclear Ownership 158
Summary 159

CHAPTER 6: PERSPECTIVES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Background of Advisory Committee Members 162
Definition of Heritage Language Education 163
Use of Other Terms 164
Heritage Language Education and Multiculturalism 165
Importance of Context 166
    Factors Influencing Program Development 167
        Community College 167
        LINGA 168
        Other Programs 168
        Political Context 169
        Research 170
    Factors Influencing Program Implementation 171
        Community College 171

    Economic Context 171
    Other Programs 172
    Political Context 173
    Social Context 174

Stakeholders in Heritage Language Instructor Training Program

  Advisory Committee 176
    Value of Role 176
    Role of Committee 176
    Managing Conflict 177
  Government Consultants 178
    Role of Consultants 178
    Level of Commitment 178
    Limits of Legislation 179
    Changes in Consultants 179
  Department of Education 180
  LINGA 181
    Focus of Organization 181
    Growth of Organization 182
    Increased Profile 182
    Stress on Human Resources 183
  Learners 184
Outcomes of the Program 184
  Successful Aspects 184

Achieving Partnership 185

Application of Learning 185

Cultural Diversity 186

Curriculum Syllabus 186

Encouraging Improvement of Practice 187

Opportunity for Government Involvement 187

Increased Sense of Self-Worth 188

Regaining Status 189

Aspects Requiring Improvement 189

Financial Resources 189

Increased Communication 190

Marketing of Program 191

Scheduling of Courses 191

Future Directions for Program 192

Accreditation of Program 192

Preparation of Community-Based Instructors 193

Videotape Materials 194

Working Collaboratively 194

Factors Which Facilitate Collaboration 195

Process Factors 195

Communication 195

Conflict Management 195

Flexibility 196

Understanding of the Project 196

Relationship Factors 197

Commitment 197

Persistence 197

Personal Connections 197

Trust 198

Structural Factors 198

Community Support 198

Leadership 199

Terms of Reference 199

Factors Detrimental to Collaboration 200

Relationship Factors 200

Changes in Consultants 200

Vested Interests 201

Resource Factors 201

Insufficient Financial Resources 201

Structural Factors 202

Lack of Planning 202

Restricting Community Power 203

Summary 203

CHAPTER 7: PERSPECTIVES OF CONSULTANTS

Background of Consultants 207

Definition of Heritage Language Education 208
Use of Other Terms 210
Heritage Language Education and Multiculturalism 211
Importance of Context 213
  Factors Influencing Program Development 213
    Community College 213
    Government Consultants 214
    LINGA 215
    Political Context 215
  Factors Influencing Program Implementation 216
    Economic Context 216
    Political Context 217
    Social Context 220

Stakeholders in Heritage Language Instructor Training Program

  Advisory Committee 221
    Role Confusion 221
  Department of Education 222
  Government Consultants 222
    Role as Consultant 223
    Limitations Faced 223
    Change of Consultants 224
  LINGA 225
    Financial Pressure 225

            Increased Profile 225
            Pride in Product 225
            Stress on Human Resources 226
            Working Together 227
Outcomes of the Program 227
      Successful Aspects 227
            Cultural Diversity 228
            Opportunity for Government Involvement 228
            Provision of Hope 229
            Recognition of Heritage Language Education 229
      Aspects Requiring Improvement 231
            Marketing the Program 231
Future Directions for Program 231
      Accreditation of the Program 231
      Preparation of Community-Based Instructors 232
Working Collaboratively 232
      Factors Which Facilitate Collaboration 233
            Process Factors 233
                  Acknowledgement 233
                  Allowing for Flexibility 234
                  Articulation of the Idea 234
                  Demonstrating Benefits 235
                  Effective Communication 235

Relationship Factors 236
  Commitment 236
  Personal Connections 237
Structural Factors 237
  Assuming Risk 238
  Clearly Defined Roles 238
  Definition of Ownership 239
  Scope of Activity 239
  Shared Vision 240
  Quality Image 240
Factors Detrimental to Collaboration 241
Process Factors 241
  Token Consultation 241
  Too Much Theory 241
Relationship Factors 242
  Forced Partnerships 242
  Token Partnerships 243
  Unequal Partnerships 243
Structural Factors 244
  Changing mandates, policies, and politics 244
  Community Ownership 245
  Pressure To Change 245
Summary 246

CHAPTER 8: PERSPECTIVES OF COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS

Background of Administrators 249

Definition of Heritage Language Education 251

Heritage Language Education and Multiculturalism 252

Importance of Context 252

  Political Context 253

Stakeholders in Heritage Language Instructor Training Program

  Advisory Committee 254

    Value of Role 255

    Changing Needs 255

    Role Confusion 256

    Issues of Power 257

    Accountability for Action 258

  Community-Based Organizations 258

    Value of Role 258

    Growth of Organization 259

    Increased Profile 259

    Stress on Human Resources 260

    Use of Volunteer Resources 260

  Educational Institution 261

    Value of Role 262

  Government Consultants 262

Value of Role 263

Change of Consultants 263

Learners 265

Outcomes of the Program 266

Successful Aspects 266

Application of Learning 267

Cultural Diversity 267

Flexibility 267

Leadership 268

Aspects Requiring Improvement 268

Financial Resources 268

Marketing of Program 269

Scheduling of Classes 269

Future Directions for Program 270

Accreditation of Program 270

Preparation of Community-Based Instructors 271

Working Collaboratively 272

Factors Which Facilitate Collaboration 272

Process Factors 272

Articulation of the Idea 273

Celebration 273

Communication 273

Continuity 274

Documentation 274

Relationship Factors 275

Commitment 275

Confidential 276

Equality 276

Passion 276

Personal Connections 276

Reciprocity 277

Respect and Trust 278

Sharing Success 279

Resource Factors 279

Adequate Funds 279

Adequate Human Resources 280

Opportunity for Reflection 280

Sufficient Time 281

Structural Factors

Clearly Defined Roles 281

Definition of Ownership 282

Shared Values 283

Factors Detrimental to Collaboration 284

Process Factors 284

Ill-defined Channels of Communication 284

Relationship Factors 284

        Being Used 285
        Competition 285
        Forced Partnerships 285
        Formal Relationships 286
        Unequal Partnerships 287
    Structural Factors 287
        Inaccurate Needs Assessment 287
        Intolerance of Mistakes 288
        Twisting the Plan 288
        Unclear Expectations 289
        Unknown Rules 290
Summary 290

CHAPTER 9: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Findings 294
Perceptions of Program Outcomes 294
Future Directions for the Program 296
Influences on Program Development 298
Influences on Program Implementation 299
Working Collaboratively 302
    Process of Partnership Leads to Programs 302
    Structure of Collaborative Ventures 304
        Defining the Nature of Partnership 304
        Importance of Stakeholders and Context 306

        - Identifying Responsibilities and Roles . . . 309
        - Determining Realistic Expectations . . . 310
        - Establishing a Supportive Infrastructure . . . 312
        - Defining Ownership of Outcomes . . . 314
        - Collaborative Leadership . . . 315
    - Communicative Challenges . . . 317
        - Shared Language and Philosophy . . . 317
        - Clear, Open Communication . . . 319
        - Conflict Management . . . 321
        - Trust and Respect . . . 323
    - Support and Reward System . . . 324
        - Caring, Commitment and Consciousness . . . 324
        - Celebration and Recognition . . . 326
        - Flexibility . . . 326
    - Not Everyone is Born to be a Collaborator . . . 327
- Conclusions . . . 328
- Implications for Future Community-Based Programs . . . 329
- Implications for Research and Theory . . . 331
    - Areas for Future Research . . . 331
    - Areas for Theory Development . . . 332

CHAPTER 10: INFLUENCE OF RESEARCH ON RESEARCHER

- Defining the Research Question . . . 334
- Emerging Uncertainty . . . 335

Stating My Values 338

Clarifying My Feelings 338

Coping with Change 338

Listening to the Voices 338

Waning Self-Confidence 339

The Power of Hope 340

CHAPTER 11: EPILOGUE 342

BIBLIOGRAPHY 345

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Characters in Case Study 355

Appendix B - Interview Guides 358

Appendix C - Informed Consent Document 364

Appendix D - Timeline of Events 365

Appendix E - Heritage Language Instructor Training Program
Terms of Reference - Advisory Committee 366

Appendix F - DACUM Chart - Heritage Language Instructor 367

Appendix G - Course Curriculum
Heritage Language Instructor Training Program 371

Appendix H - Schedule of Advisory Committee Meetings 374

Chapter 1

RATIONALE, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

> To this day I still remember that initial meeting with the group of heritage language instructors. Little did I know the challenges that I would face, both personally and professionally during the following six years as a consequence of agreeing to work with this group. Nor did I know that their concerns would become so much a part of me that this community education activity would become the focus of my doctoral research. If I had known then what I know now, perhaps I would have not accepted the challenge of undertaking such an initiative. Such is the nature of our work as adult educators; we never know what will occur until it already has. It is this constant sense of the unknown which feeds our curiosity and motivates us to conquer the challenges which uncertainty mitigates. (Wendy, October, 1992)

Introduction

Adult educators, particularly those of us working in the community setting, seldom take the time to share our learning with our colleagues. Often our excuse is that our time is too limited; we must be 'doing' and not spending time 'reflecting'. We rely upon a select group of academics to describe the practice of adult education and then question the value of such a theoretical perspective (Knox, 1982; Kowalski, 1993). More specifically, Wear and Cook (1986) proposed three possible reasons for the lack of theoretical activity among community educators: community education staff are rewarded for concrete results; community educators may not possess the skills for critical reflection; and, confusion exists in the terminology used to describe the discipline.

Much has been written concerning the design and implementation of adult education programs. However, the primary focus has been the development of models and theories to improve practice (Cervero, 1992). Only recently, have some researchers recognized the value of publishing case studies that more fully describe the process of program planning and implementation (Cervero, 1992; Cervero and Wilson, 1993; Merriam, 1988), thus providing greater opportunity for critical reflection on practice.

Connecting the Voices is the story of the efforts of a community college to design and implement an adult education program in collaboration with the community. Community was defined as stakeholders or those with a vested interest in the project. Over time, this community changed as new members emerged and others retired.

The phrase "connecting the voices" describes the challenges faced in coalescing the divergent opinions, actions and expectations of the stakeholder groups involved with the program over its six year history. Working with these stakeholders required constant attention to their voices - whether it was a learner expressing confusion about a homework assignment, an advisory committee member questioning the curriculum, an instructor requesting a change of classroom, a consultant advising of a change in policy, or an administrator requiring justification of program expenditures. Moreover, the Heritage Language Instructor Training program itself is concerned with voice - oral language and multicultural voices.

I have actively listened to the voices of the stakeholders for the past six years, initially, as a partner in the creation of the program. For the past four years I have balanced the responsibility for management of the program with that of researching the process. During the past two years, the balancing act has become more complex as I assumed instructional duties within the program. Many times I needed to be listened to as I articulated to the community which role I was assuming and negotiated their acceptance of this role.

The Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the processes and outcomes involved in the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. The perspectives presented are those held by the stakeholders involved with the project over a period of six years. Of particular interest was the influence of the economic, political, and social environments upon the development and implementation of the program and the way in which the stakeholders worked together.

The following questions provided direction for the research:

1. What factors and/or situations influenced the decision to develop a program to prepare heritage language instructors?
2. What factors and/or situations influenced the implementation of the program?
3. How were the stakeholders involved at various stages in the project?

4. How did the various stakeholders define the outcomes of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program?

5. What forces, factors, processes, and structures influenced the way in which these stakeholders worked together on this program?

6. What factors did the stakeholders identify that affected working collaboratively?

The Significance of the Study

The study of the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program has had a direct effect upon the practice of the college staff and the community members involved with the project. The opportunity to reflect critically upon this program has been instrumental in developing new understandings of the process of collaboration and strategies which support stakeholders working together effectively.

From a broader perspective, the planning and implementation of educational programs in collaboration with the community has, within the past few years, become an area of growing interest (Cervero, 1992; Knox, 1993; Mawhinney, 1993). As resources to support educational programs decline, greater importance is placed upon the premise of needs-oriented education (Allen, 1987, 1992). As well, those organizations which provide funds for adult education programs are requesting that such activities involve partnerships between educational institutions and other stakeholders.

With an increased expectation on the part of government that post-secondary institutions become entrepreneurial organizations, individuals who are not familiar with the community education process are being asked to develop programs in collaboration with stakeholders. This research provides a perspective on the elements critical to the achievement of such partnerships.

From an academic perspective this research has significance for those engaged in collaborative working relationships within the educational sector, the public sector, and the community. It provides an opportunity to integrate and reflect upon theory from the separate fields of adult education, community education, and program planning and implementation. As well, it adds to the Canadian adult education literature a detailed, longitudinal case study of program planning and implementation. Finally, my comments on the experience of studying an educational innovation, while directly contributing to its development and implementation and actively engaging with various stakeholders (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973), may be useful to others who undertake similar research.

Definition of Terms

The key terms used throughout the study are defined below in order to clarify their meanings in context.

Advisory Committee: A committee comprised of representatives from various stakeholder groups established to provide advice to the college concerning the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

College: This term refers to Community College, the educational institution which was involved in the development and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

Community Education: The linking of community agencies, groups, and resources to collaboratively establish activities responsive to identified educational needs (Quinney, 1984).

DACUM: An acronym for "Designing A CUrriculuM". A program planning model used to analyze a vocational area, describe training goals, and recommend instructional approaches to achieve these goals.

Heritage Language: A term which refers to an ancestral language which does not have status as an official language at the national level or any language other than the two official languages of Canada (English and French).

Heritage Language Education: The teaching of heritage languages in a variety of formal and informal contexts.

Research Methodology

The intent of the study was to describe the process of the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, from the perspectives of the stakeholder groups, in an effort to gain an understanding of the various factors which affected this process. To accomplish this goal a case study approach was adopted and data were collected through interviews, participant observation, and a review of primary source documents.

Preliminary Investigation

Data collection commenced in September, 1989 with a number of preliminary investigations to determine the feasibility of the proposed research methods. The researcher became more aware of the current status of heritage language education as well as the challenges facing heritage language instructors and those operating community-based heritage language schools. During this phase of the research, an initial list was developed of potential interviewees, data sources, as well as key events that the researcher wanted to attend. The researcher held several discussions with two key informants; a staff member at the college and an executive member of the non-profit organization. Through these discussions the researcher determined the feasibility of studying the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program and identified potentially sensitive areas.

The second phase of the preliminary investigation involved discussions with individuals more closely affiliated with Community College. The research proposal was presented to the members of the Heritage Language Instructor Training Program Advisory Committee for their review and approval. The committee members endorsed the proposal and indicated their willingness to provide the researcher with access to documents and relevant meetings and to be interviewed. A word of caution was offered by several committee members, concerning the potential hesitancy of heritage language instructors to be interviewed, in light of the unprofessional conduct of a consultant conducting a recent research project in the community-operated schools.

The research proposal was also reviewed by several Community College staff, including the dean of the academic division responsible for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the vice-president academic, and the director of research for the college. At the time, Community College was in the midst of developing a formal policy for research conducted within the institution. Rather than delay the approval of the proposal for several months, until such time as the policy was finalized, the vice-president academic personally granted approval to conduct the research.

Pilot Study

During March, 1990 a pilot study was conducted with a member of the program advisory committee, an instructor, and a learner, all of whom were actively involved during the implementation phase of the program. The pilot study served three purposes. First, it provided the researcher with experience conducting semi-structured interviews and experience transcribing and analysing data collected in this manner. Second, the pilot study enabled the researcher to become more familiar with the field, determine factors which may have influenced the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, and appreciate the varying perspectives held by the interviewees. Third, through these interviews the researcher was able to refine the focus of the study, modify research questions, and validate the interview guide used in the pilot study. The pilot study made the researcher aware of the discomfort of the learners with having their comments tape-recorded and their frustration with their English fluency.

The outcomes of the pilot study reaffirmed for the researcher that the study was of value and that the adoption of a descriptive/analytic case study method would be most appropriate for the inquiry. The researcher further concluded that interviews, participant observation, and document analysis would be the preferred data collection techniques.

Case Study Design

The adoption of a case study approach to the research provided the opportunity to explore and discover the experiences of the stakeholder groups (Merriam, 1988). Stake (1983, p. 35) noted the unique quality that case studies offer and explained that "when properly done they extend personal experiences and refine experiential knowledge to be (1) more concrete, (2) more contextual, (3) more developed by reader interpretation, and (4) more based on reference populations that are defined by the reader's previous experience."

Yin (1984, p. 13) suggested that case studies are the "preferred strategy when "how" or "why" questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context." He further commented that a case study approach is appropriate when "the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not clearly evident and multiple sources of evidence are used" (p. 23). Yin (1984, p. 23) concluded that "the central tendency among all types of case study, is that it tries to illuminate a decision or set of decisions: why they were taken, how they were implemented and with what result."

Shaw (1978, p. 4) proposed an inherent weakness in purely descriptive case studies is that "little or nothing is said about process" or the interaction among variables described in the account. The inclusion of an analytic aspect to case study research, according to Shaw (1978, p. 6), provides "a study of process as well as outcome, represents greater depth and a more elaborate form of the case study."

Data Collection Procedures

Qualitative research allows for the natural environment to be the direct source of the data. It enables the researcher to be the key determinant in describing and observing events, or interviewing actors to determine how they interpret or ascribe meaning and significance to events under observation and consideration (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982, p. 27). The adoption of a qualitative approach to the research complemented the unique strength of the case study to have the capacity to embody a wide variety of evidence and to support a multi-method approach to research (Brewer and Hunter, 1989). Data collection and analysis involved four research activities: (a) in-depth interviewing of selected individuals involved in various capacities in the development and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program; (b) participant observation in the classroom, program advisory committee meetings, executive and general meetings of the non-profit organization (LINGA), meetings with government consultants, and various public forums, workshops and conferences related to heritage language education; (c) the analysis of curriculum guides, minutes of meetings, position papers, proposals, policy documents, memoranda, evaluation reports; and, (d) the analysis of the researcher's personal journal.

Interviews

Interviews were the major data gathering technique for the study. The interview transcripts provided data concerning the subjective perspectives of the stakeholders on issues related to the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. The interviews were used for three purposes: (a) to identify the perspectives of stakeholders involved with the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program; (b) to provide a richer perspective on the forces, factors, and situations that influenced the design and implementation of the program which could enhance the interpretation of historic documents; and, (c) to allow stakeholders to express personal opinions that were not recorded in documents.

Interview method. Patton (1980) suggested that the advantage of using semi-structured interviews was that:

> [t]he interviewer remains free to build conversation within a particular subject area, to word questions spontaneously and to establish a comfortable style but with the focus and particular subject that has been predetermined. (p. 200)

The establishment of a conversational tone for the interviews was important, particularly in situations where the interviewees expressed concerns about their ability to present their ideas. Semi-structured interviews were used in order to achieve "comparable data across subjects" (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982, p. 136). This helped to focus data collection and facilitate data analysis. The interview guides (included in Appendix B) were developed to reflect the research questions and to allow opportunities for interviewees to report their own personal experiences and points of view. Five interview guides were constructed, with the majority of questions being common to all guides. Where the interviewee held dual roles in relation to the program, such as instructor and advisory committee member, both guides were used. This approach was particularly useful when identifying the themes that emerged from the interviews, since it heightened the researcher's awareness of the varying perspectives presented by certain interviewees.

A few changes were made to the questions included in the interview guides as a result of conducting the pilot study. As well, the researcher learned through this experience that the questions need not be addressed in a predetermined order but rather could be grouped together in response to the comments made by the interviewee. Thus, the first two questions on each of the interview guides tended to be the only ones asked in a specific order.

Interview procedure. Thirty-one formal interviews were conducted during the period June 1990 to May 1993, with 35 individuals including 13 learners, five instructors, four advisory committee members, six consultants, and two administrators. The stakeholder concept was used to identify interviewees for the study, with stakeholders being defined as "all those individuals and parties, organized groups and professions, and institutions which have an effect upon an activity or environment" (Mitroff, 1983, p. 22). Mitroff (1983) proposed seven approaches to identify these stakeholders:

(a) the imperative approach which identifies stakeholders who feel strongly enough about an organization's proposed policies or actions to act on their feelings;

(b) the positional approach which identifies those stakeholders that occupy formal positions in the policy-making structure, whether internal or external to the organization, for example, government;

(c) the reputational approach which entails asking various knowledgeable or important persons to nominate those who they believe have a stake in the system;

(d) the social-participation approach which identifies individuals or organizations as stakeholders to the extent that they participate in activities related to the policy issue;

(e) the opinion-leadership approach which identifies those that influence the opinions of others;

(f) the demographic approach which identifies stakeholders by such characteristics as age, sex, race, occupation, religion, place of birth, and level of education; and,

(g) the focal organization approach which seeks to identify the individuals and organizations who have important relationships with the focal organization.

Six of these seven approaches were used to identify the interviewees for this research, the demographic approach being the one not utilized. Two additional techniques were used to locate and select the interviewees; snowball sampling and purposeful sampling. Snowball sampling occurs when the interviewer asks the first person interviewed to recommend others. This technique was similar to Mitroff's positional and reputational approaches to the identification of stakeholders. During the latter stages of the data collection process, the researcher was concerned that the interviewees were plagued by 'group think'. Bogdan and Biklen (1982) suggested that at this point, when consistent themes have emerged from the data, it is important to solicit contrary evidence which can provide a new perspective to the data analysis. In this study, purposive sampling, where "the researcher uses his or her own judgement about which respondents to choose and picks only those who best meet the purposes of the study" (Bailey, 1982, p. 99), allowed for the gathering of an 'outsider' perspective. To this end, the researcher interviewed two language education consultants and three community college administrators who were not directly involved with the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

The interviewees were contacted by telephone and the purpose of the study was explained to them. Once an individual agreed to participate, an interview date, time and location were determined. Interviews were conducted with the instructors and the learners during their own personal time. Many of these people chose to be interviewed at their home or at a restaurant. The interviews with members of the advisory committee, the government consultants, and the college administrators took place during the day at their place of work. Three advisory committee members did not wish to be interviewed and one learner had moved away from the city before an interview could be conducted.

At the time of the interview, the purpose of the study was explained once again and the procedure for the interview was clarified. Before commencing the interview, the interviewee was provided with two copies of an informed consent document (see Appendix C) which were to be read and signed.

Reynolds (1979) advised that when conducting descriptive research within the community setting it is important to be aware of the indirect effects for the participants:

> Indirect effects for the participants may occur upon appearance of published accounts of the fieldwork. These effects, both positive and negative, may include those experienced by the individuals specifically discussed in the published accounts and those associated with the discussion of the community or social unit. (p. 179)

Although pseudonyms were used when the data were presented, in some cases the individuals may be recognizable by their comments. The interviewees were advised that a full transcription of their interview would be provided to them, in order that they could edit or remove any material which they deemed inaccurate or sensitive.

Twenty-eight single interviews were conducted ranging from 45 minutes to 4 hours in length, with the average length being 1 hour. The interviews were tape-recorded with the recorder being shut off at the request of the interviewee or during times when the conversation diverged from the research topic. Several of the learners were nervous at having their voices taped. In an effort to avert this feeling, the researcher would shut off the tape recorder and allow the interviewees time to formulate their thoughts. In situations where the interview was conducted in a home or restaurant, there were times when the interview had to be momentarily postponed because of food service, or other family members joining the conversation. Only one interviewee refused to be tape-recorded and in this case detailed notes of the conversation were prepared by the researcher and submitted for review.

The three two-person interviews that were conducted with the learners ranged between one and one half and 2 hours in length. Initially, the researcher hoped to interview the learners in three-person focus groups; however, due to the personal schedules of these individuals this was not possible. Conducting the interviews with the learners in pairs provided them with an opportunity to build upon each other's ideas and to debate their points of view. Conversation was more relaxed and spontaneous and the tape recorder was all but forgotten.

The researcher was interviewed through the process of interviewing others. During several of the interviews, the researcher participated in the discussion and these comments were later transcribed and edited.

Revisions to interview transcripts. The researcher personally transcribed 27 of the 31 interviews. This decision was made for tapes which had the following conditions: (a) the interviewee spoke English as her/his second language and possessed a strong accent; (b) the interviewee spoke very quickly and relied heavily upon the use of acronyms and jargon; or (c) the interviewee's comments were barely audible because of background noise. In these cases, the notes prepared by the researcher during the interview proved invaluable.

In the case of interviewees who spoke English as their second language, the transcripts were edited slightly before being returned to the interviewees. The grammar, verb tense or verb agreement was not altered in these documents, rather "ums", "ahs" and multiple starts to sentences were edited. The researcher struggled with the ethics of altering the transcripts; however, an academic who had conducted research with English as a Second Language speakers for many years advised her that in doing so she "would not demoralize interviewees by returning transcripts which highlighted their ESL problems" (DT, 1993).

The researcher telephoned all interviewees to confirm that they had received their interview transcripts and to inquire whether they would be submitting revisions to her. Only three interviewees returned their transcripts to the researcher with changes of a minor nature indicated.

Document Analysis

Primary source documents were used to provide a perspective on the factors and situations which affected the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. These documents were also used to corroborate, elaborate, and validate, or in some cases contradict the data collected through interviews.

Kerlinger (1973) suggested the value of distinguishing between primary and secondary source documents:

> A primary source document is the original repository of an historical datum, like an original record kept of an important occasion, an eyewitness description of an event, a photograph, minutes of organizational meetings...A secondary source is an account or record of an historical event or circumstance one or more steps removed from an original repository. (p. 702)

Primary source documents included articles, briefs, correspondence, memoranda, news releases, reports, and other relevant documents which were obtained with permission from the files of the government consultants and other stakeholders involved in the design and/or implementation of the program. Most of the documents pertaining to the program were "working documents" such as proposals, agendas for meetings, course evaluations and reports. The researcher was a participant observer at a number of the events where these documents were developed. This provided further data to clarify the purpose of and the context in which these documents were produced.

Participant Observation

McCall and Simmons (1969) described the omnibus quality of participant observation as:

> ...a characteristic blend of techniques...[which] involves some genuinely social interaction in the field with the subjects of the study, some direct observation of relevant events, some formal and a great deal of informal interviewing, some systematic counting, some collection of documents and artifacts, and open-endedness in the direction the study takes. (p. 1)

These authors (1969, p. 3) further explained participant observation as "not as a single method but as a type of research enterprise, a style of combining several methods toward a particular end. That end is an analytic description of a complex social organization."

Between October 1987 and December 1993, the researcher spent 1200 hours as a participant observer in a variety of settings directly and indirectly relevant to the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. These hours were spent as a participant observer in the classroom, advisory committee meetings, meetings with government consultants, meetings with the curriculum developer, DACUM meetings, conference presentations, public forums, executive and general membership meetings of LINGA. Approximately one third of this time was spent as a participant observer at events which tangentially related to the program, such as celebrations in the learners' ethnocultural communities, conducting workshops for ethnocultural communities, multicultural conferences and workshops, and social gatherings of the learners. This extensive involvement as a participant observer provided opportunities to meet and speak with those involved in heritage language education across Canada. Particularly in the case of the learners, it fostered the development of rapport (Zeph, 1991) which proved helpful during data collection.

Schatzman and Strauss (1973) further stressed the value of participant observation as a way to understand the meaning given to events by participants as follows:

> The researcher **must** get close to the people whom he studies; he understands that their actions are best comprehended when observed on the spot - in the natural ongoing environment where they live and work...The researcher himself must be at the location, not only to watch but also to listen to the symbolic sounds that characterize this world. A dialogue with persons in their natural situations will reveal the nuances of meaning from which their perspectives and definitions are constantly forged (in Kalnins, 1986, pp. 5-6)

Principles of Data Collection

Yin (1984) advised that three principles should be followed in data collection: the use of multiple sources of evidence, the creation of a case study data base, and the maintenance of a chain of evidence. In addition to data collected through interviews, participant observation and document analysis, the researcher's journal notes and records of informal conversations with the stakeholders were analyzed. All sources of evidence were reviewed and analyzed together, so that the findings were based on the convergence of information from various sources and triangulation of the data were achieved.

The absence of a formal data base for most case study research efforts has been identified as a major weakness of such research (Yin, 1984). In an effort to develop a data base for the study, the following actions were taken: (a) transcripts of interviews were maintained on computer disk and in print format; (b) primary source documents were filed by topic or the nature of the document (for example, minutes of advisory committee meetings); and, (c) progressive stages of the analysis chapters of the dissertation were maintained on computer disk and in print so as to provide a record of the re-organization of the data.

Yin (1984) recommended the maintenance of a chain of evidence to increase the reliability of the information in a case study. To this end, the following procedures were adopted: (a) specific citations were provided for documents, interviews and observations; (b) the circumstances under which the data were collected were recorded, such as time and place of an interview; and, (c) the data collection process followed the procedures outlined in the research proposal.

Data Analysis Procedure

McCall and Simmons (1969) cautioned researchers that a set of standard procedures for the analysis of qualitative data does not exist.

> Qualitative analysts do not often enjoy the operational advantages of their quantitative cousins in being able to predict their own analytic process; consequently, they cannot refine and order their raw data by operations built initially into the designs of the research. (p.113)

This reality challenged the researcher, who had employed quantitative methods in conducting her undergraduate and masters level research. Bogdan and Biklen (1982) provided more guidance, offering data analysis procedures which they considered appropriate for this type of study:

> Data analysis is the process of systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, field notes, and other materials that you accumulate to increase your own understanding of them and to enable you to present what you have discovered to others. Analysis involves the working with data, organizing it, breaking it into manageable units, synthesizing it, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what you will tell others. (p. 145)

The processes of data collection and data analysis occurred concurrently in this study. As McCall and Simmons (1969) suggested:

> ...the researcher starts analysing very early in the research process...he needs to analyze as he goes along both to adjust his observational strategies, shifting some emphases towards those experiences which bear upon the development of his understanding, and generally, to exercise control over his emerging ideas by virtually simultaneous "checking" or "testing" of these ideas. (p. 110)

Organizing the Data

After each interview, workshop or meeting was concluded the researcher would record in a journal her feelings, perceptions, reflections, questions, understandings, and ideas which arose as a result of the experience. Thus, the researcher reflected upon the data in a continuous manner which assisted in the identification of themes, questions, and conclusions.

Six general research questions guided the initial collection and analysis of the data. As data collection and analysis proceeded, it became evident that the interviewees had few comments concerning how politics, policies and organizational values affected the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. They were more interested in talking about program outcomes and how the stakeholders worked together. This situation forced the researcher to re-evaluate the questions as she reflected upon the words of McCall and Simmons (1969):

> The primacy of the goal of description calls for an intellectual responsiveness on the part of the scientist toward the organization, a willingness to see what is there, and a reluctance to hastily superimpose a preconceived framework of the observer. (p. 19)

The researcher continued to use the interview guides which had been developed. However, as the amount of data collected increased, the researcher decided to delimit the study and focus on the predominant themes which emerged consistently from the five stakeholder groups.

Generating Categories and Themes

Schatzman and Strauss (1973) portrayed this process of data analysis in qualitative research as follows:

> Probably the most fundamental operation in the analysis of qualitative data is that of discovering significant classes of things, persons and events and the properties which characterize them. In this process, which continues throughout the research, the analyst gradually comes to reveal his own "is's" and "because's": he names classes and links one with another, at first with "simple" statements (propositions) that express the linkages, and continues this

> process until his propositions fall into sets, in an ever-increasing density of linkages.(p. 110)

The second stage of data analysis occurred after all of the interviews had been conducted and fully transcribed. The organization and unitization of the data commenced with a line-by-line review of each transcript. This initial analysis resulted in the assigning of unit labels which were then entered into the computer along with the relevant passage from the transcript, which was identified by the interviewee's alpha designator and the line numbers from the transcript. The data were sorted into five files, a separate file for each stakeholder group. For those interviewees whose responses could be recorded in several files, a decision was made to include their responses in the file which represented their most significant role as a stakeholder. Thus, those instructors who were also members of the program advisory committee had their comments reported in the instructor file.

The unit labels were then compared with the passages of transcript to determine whether they described the data accurately. This resulted in some refinements of the labels. A matrix of the unit labels located in the five files was developed to assist with the comparative review. The labels within a file were then compared for duplication and a process of grouping the labels was begun. The labels across the five files were also compared for consistency. Further refinements of the labels occurred as a result of this cross-file review.

Observational and documentary data were then reviewed to search for consistent and new unit labels. These data were not analyzed to the same degree as the interview transcripts. Rather these data were utilized for purposes of triangulation (Denzin, 1978; Jick, 1979) and to provide "thicker" description of some phenomena (Geertz, 1973).

The determining of patterns, themes and categories in the data was achieved by employing both indigenous typologies and analyst-constructed typologies (Patton, 1980). After several attempts to develop an outline for presenting the data, the focused set of themes emerged. The data were subjected to one more stage of analysis which was a review of the literature on collaboration in program development and implementation. The literature was used as a means to compare themes, identify additional research questions, and provide some further reflection upon practice.

In keeping with the stakeholder model which was primarily used to identify interviewees and the data analysis process, the researcher decided to present the data in chapters reflecting the various stakeholders. It was intended that by adopting this approach, the voices of the respective stakeholders would be heard distinctly by the reader.

Communicating the Data

McCall and Simmons (1969) suggest that the opportunity to communicate the data will aid the researcher in selecting what portions of the data to report and creating an organizational scheme for the data. The researcher was fortunate to have several opportunities throughout the course of the study to tell the story of her research, including four presentations at academic research conferences and forums, two seminar presentations to graduate students, and five presentations at field-based conferences. The review of notes and materials prepared for these presentations also contributed to the development of unit labels and themes for the data. Corbin and Strauss (1991) proposed that such sharing of the data can occur before the analysis is completed and that presentations made to varied audiences will serve to enrich the researcher's interpretation of the data.

The researcher also established several techniques to discuss her research with other doctoral students. One such approach was the development of a "critical friend" with whom to exchange stories, resources, strategies and to talk through the stress created by active engagement in one's research. A second strategy was the formation of a study group which provided a weekly opportunity for researchers to exchange ideas about research, share resources, and offer formative feedback concerning each other's research. The third technique was the selection of two peer reviewers who read interview transcripts to verify meaning and critiqued substantial portions of the dissertation. These peer reviewers also provided guidance and support during the demanding periods of data analysis and writing. One of the peer reviewers had the opportunity to attend a public forum on heritage language education, teach one class within the program, and attend a community celebration. This exposure to the stakeholders provided an increased sensitivity to the nature of the study.

Standards of Rigor

Yin (1984) proposed four tests of rigor appropriate to case study research - construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability.

Construct Validity

This test is particularly challenging in case study research given the subjective nature of data collection. Three strategies which can increase construct validity are the use of multiple sources of evidence, the establishment of a chain of evidence, and having key informants review the draft case study report. In this study, multiple sources of data were employed, a chain of evidence was maintained, and the case study and the data analysis chapters were reviewed by a key informant. As well, longevity in the research site (six years) and the sharing of data analysis with peers and research experts increased validity (Zeph, 1991).

Internal Validity

Yin (1984) suggested that internal validity is only a concern for causal or explanatory case studies. Given the analytical nature of this research, pattern matching was employed in determining the convergence of the data.

Guba and Lincoln (1981) recommended credibility as an alternative measure to internal validity. Credibility is determined by the extent to which people can recognize their experiences in the reporting of the data, and other researchers and readers can recognize the experience having read the study. The interpretation and presentation of the interview transcript data provided a test of recognition of the stakeholders experiences. A review of the accounting of events reported in Chapter 3 provided a further opportunity for the stakeholders, and other community education practitioners to recognize the authenticity of the situation. The perspectives of the stakeholders have confirmed the credibility of the account.

Credibility is further enhanced when the researcher interprets her/his own behaviors and experiences in relation to other participants and offers comment concerning the effect of the research upon her/himself. The inclusion of reflective comments by the researcher fulfils this requirement.

External Validity

Case studies rely upon analytical generalization and as such have limited generalizability (Yin, 1984). The findings of this research can be generalized to theory pertaining to the process of program design and implementation in the contexts of adult and community education. A review of the program planning and collaboration literature and the five interviews conducted with practitioners external to the case study suggest that the research findings "fit" (Guba and Lincoln, 1981) with the experiences of others working collaboratively with the community in designing and implementing programs.

Reliability

Adopting measures which will allow for another investigator to replicate the case study research and reach the same findings and conclusions is particularly challenging in case study research. In an effort to increase the reliability of the research, a case study data base and an audit trail were maintained. An explanation of the researcher's position and triangulation of data further ensured reliability (Merriam, 1988).

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in the conduct of the study:

1. An extensive review of the current literature of program planning and implementation in adult education and planned change indicated that much was to be learned about collaborating with the community in the implementation of programs. It was assumed that the descriptive nature of this study would add to the knowledge in this area.
2. The researcher actively participated in the activity which is under study. As a result of the documentation of the challenges encountered in this undertaking, this research will add to the knowledge in the area.
3. Stakeholders play a key role in the development, implementation and evaluation of education programs. The descriptive nature of this study will provide evidence of the extent of stakeholder involvement.

Delimitations and Limitations

The study was bounded by the time period from October 1987 to December 1993. The first date served as a natural beginning date since it marked the inaugural meeting to discuss the development of a program for heritage language instructors. The termination point was more difficult to determine in light of the continuance of the program. The researcher decided that by December, 1993 the full cycle of program development and implementation had been completed. The following limitations applied to the study:

1. The study was limited by the willingness of individuals to be interviewed, by their ability to accurately recall events of significance, and by their willingness to provide certain information.
2. Since the study was being conducted concurrently with the development and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the researcher had to rely upon interview data and participant observation to determine decisions and events. Where possible, primary source documents (ie. minutes of meetings, proposals, memoranda, reports, questionnaires) were employed to supplement the interview data.
3. The conclusions and recommendations of the study are based on a single case study and therefore will have limited generalizability.

Organization of the Thesis

The thesis is organized into 11 chapters. In Chapter 1 the research design and methodology adopted for the study is presented. Chapter 2 includes an overview of the pertinent literature related to adult and community education, program planning and implementation, and collaboration. Chapter 3 chronologically documents the development and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program from October 1987 to December 1993. This case study provides a sense of the interactions between stakeholder groups and the interplay of context.

The presentation of the major findings is divided into five chapters each documenting the perspective of a different stakeholder constituency: the learners (Chapter 4), the advisory committee members (Chapter 5), the instructors (Chapter 6), the government consultants (Chapter 7) and the college administrators (Chapter 8). Chapter 9 provides a discussion and interpretation of the collective perspectives of the stakeholders and offers conclusions and recommendations reflecting the data analysis and earlier discussions. Chapter 10 informs the reader of more recent developments concerning the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. The concluding chapter describes the influences which the research had upon the researcher.

Chapter 2

RELATED LITERATURE

> The fragility of adult and continuing education - the uncertain funding, the heavy dependence on part-time faculty and staff, the ambiguous status as an independent and professional field, and the secondary importance within the organization - contributes, perhaps ironically, to the largely positive attitude that adult and continuing educators have toward the future...Our optimism may also be owing to our tendency to see adult and continuing education as a force for transformation, change, and progress toward a better world. (Edelson, 1992, p.5)

This review of the literature pertaining to program planning and implementation in adult and community education is presented in an attempt to identify pertinent issues particularly with respect to the process of collaboration. Selected literature from the fields of critical theory, and policy planning and implementation is also presented to provide a broader perspective.

Defining Community and Community Education

A necessary prerequisite to actively engaging in the community education process is to define the community within which the activity will occur. As several authors have explained, the search for an adequate, universally acceptable definition of the term 'community' has continued to prove illusive. Notions of the meaning of the term have derived from the knowledge bases, experiences, and moral, ideological, and philosophical perspectives of the researchers (Clark, 1987; Fletcher, 1987; Mens, 1974); yet the parameters of definition have continued to blur in response to theory and practice.

Brookfield (1983a, p. 154) suggested that the word community holds "great emotional potency" for adult educators. The term community is multidimensional in both scope and perspective (Galbraith, 1990). Moreover, it is inherently value-laden and holds a variety of meanings for a diverse range of individuals. The inability to singularly define the term community has contributed to the inability to establish a definition of and a universal philosophical base for the concept of community education (Beder, 1987).

Numerous frameworks exist for understanding and defining the word community. While a geographic definition of community is most common, others propose that the emphasis should focus on the common interests, values, and functions of people (Bellah et al., 1985; Hiemstra, 1972; Warren, 1988; Wright, 1980). Brookfield (1983) further claimed that there exist communities of interest and communities of function which may supersede geographic boundaries. Clark (1987) described communities from five perspectives; as a human collective, as territory, as shared activities, as close-knit relationships, and as sentiment. Within this study, the researcher viewed the heritage language community from the perspective of community as sentiment. This perspective gives the community "the emotive dynamic it deserves and grounds it in the experience of actors" (Clark, 1987, p.55) and creates a community with a sense of solidarity.

The community is considered to have functional needs which lend themselves to educational interventions and is thus a legitimate focus for adult education activities (White, 1980). Galbraith (1990) viewed this connection between community and adult education as particularly significant:

> Adult education can serve as a means for self-fulfilment as well as for social, political and psychological empowerment. When community and adult education are connected both conceptually and in practice, a unique relationship is developed that offers communities and individuals a sense of hope and dignity, a sense of responsibility for their own communities and lives, and a voice in the social and political arenas. The connection suggests a liberating significance for individuals, groups, and communities. (p.7)

Community education requires responsiveness. Its process demands action, constant analysis, critique, and review. Despite the confusion in articulation, the community education process still provides a viable strategy for the analysis and diagnosis of needs and the development of solutions.

The Heritage Language Instructor Training program was characterized by the requirement to work within a variety of ethnocultural communities. Community education proposes a framework whereby culturally diverse communities can respond positively to change and societal issues can be addressed (Kowalski and Fallon, 1986; Bryant, 1989). Briscoe (1990) advocates that community education is a concept that provides an appropriate process for responding to the needs of a culturally diverse society since it seeks to integrate community and learning. Community education proposes a way of life that involves "people working together in total partnership to identify an ideal and a means of realizing it" (Briscoe, 1990 p.81).

The very essence of community education encourages widespread input, cooperation, and the opportunity for collaboration. Kowalski (1987, p. 52) proposed that "community education identifies a process (a method of mobilizing the community to deal with its needs, problems, et cetera), a product (the actual programs put into place), and a philosophical foundation which provides values and direction for...elements of the community to work together." Ward and Taylor (1986) considered positive action and collaboration at the local level to be the most salient features of community education. By acknowledging community education as a process of specific interventions into specific contexts (Baron, 1988) the essential role of involving stakeholder groups is further reinforced.

With regard to the involvement of stakeholder groups, community education represents a significant attempt to bring education and community into a more equal relationship (Allen, 1987). Community education implies a willingness to reverse some of the traditional 'us' and 'them' relationships through partnership and solidarity rather than paternalism or manipulation (Martin, 1987). It provides an opportunity for those who have the least power in society to analyze a situation and achieve political change.

Responding to Community Needs

Forest (1981) proposed that the closer the goal-setting and resultant program planning process is to the local level, the more likely will goals be specific to the local participants and unique to their values and needs. Other researchers have supported the importance of the needs and motivations of potential learners as crucial to deciding program goals (Boshier, 1971; Forest, 1973; Houle, 1961; Maier, 1963; Sheffield, 1964).

Knox (1993, p. 43) advises that "adult educators should not participate in social intervention except to meet client goals as the client perceives them. The goals of adult education are not defined solely in relation to social goals. The learners have their own felt needs to be met." Strother and Klus stressed that such needs are not static and, that to be effective, those planning adult education programs need to look beyond the immediately and obviously relevant. They contended that program planners need to look

> ...at what lies directly ahead and what lies beyond the bend in the road. The first aspect is mainly a matter simply of adequate data gathering and interpretation; the second aspect involves imaginative interpretation of data and ingenious use of forecasting methods, professional journals, government publications, conventions, professional meetings, and newspapers. (Strother and Klus, 1982 p. 23)

In order to accurately determine future needs Strother and Klus identified the requirement to read in other areas and to gather information concerning future trends through expert opinion, government agencies, foundations, and national associations. These authors further cautioned that "the horizons of individuals and organizations would grow very little if institutions responded only to concrete proposals from some ready user group" (p. 27) since the potential user is often unable to articulate needs or is unaware of certain needs. There appears to be universal acceptance of the premise that needs assessment is most effective when clients and institutions are working in concert (Knox, 1982b; Votruba, 1981); yet practitioners are faced with a dilemma in the sense that "the flexibility that is required to serve the people's needs is restricted by the pressure upon the developer to support the sponsoring institution to follow its program prescriptions" (Biddle and Biddle, 1965, p. 261).

Program planning for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was achieved at the local level through active stakeholder involvement. Despite this approach, accurate reflection of future needs proved challenging due to economic and political factors.

Program Planning and Implementation in the Community Context

The planning of adult education and more specifically community education programs occurs within a complex array of personal, organizational and social relations of power among stakeholders who may have "similar, differing, or conflicting sets of interests regarding the program" (Cervero and Wilson, 1992, p. 60). This situation raises the question of accountability: to whom is the adult educator ethically and politically accountable? Cervero (1994) has proposed that the educational planner is responsible for negotiating the interests of all those who may be affected by the program. This requirement presents challenges because of both historical and structurally embedded relations of power which may constrain the program planner's ability to do so.

Yet, in view of the political nature of the world, rational planning practice can only be achieved if program planners carefully evaluate the organizational contexts in which they work and act in response to these situations (Forester, 1989). Typically asymmetrical relations of power will impede the achievement of truly democratic planning and determination of stakeholders involved in the process.

Community education programs are planned and offered within the context of the providing agency(ies) together with the organizational or community context in which the learners function (Knox, 1979). A wide range of economic, political and social influences affect adult education provider agencies and program planners need to take note of resources and influences which characterize these contexts and incorporate them in the program planning process (Knox, 1993). For the Heritage Language Instructor Training program these influences presented numerous challenges and significantly affected program outcomes.

Involving Stakeholder Groups

In virtually every aspect of adult education, the need to address the requirements of multiple stakeholders is demonstrated (Thompson, Oxman, and Haynes, 1992). Cervero and Wilson (1994, p. 28), in conducting case study research of program planning in a variety of contexts, concluded that "programs are constructed by people with multiple interests working in specific institutional contexts that profoundly affect their form and content."

Mitroff (1983) recommended the incorporation of multiple stakeholders in the planning process. He suggested that the divergent perspectives held by these individuals would lead to a more comprehensive and responsive solution to the given problem. Inclusion of stakeholder groups in the program planning process allows for the determination of assumptions held by the various parties and a systematic review of the problem.

Knox (1993, p. 472) further considered the inclusion of stakeholders in the program development and implementation process as increasing the "salience of societal influences and contextual analysis to understand them." Through this enriched contextual analysis the program planner can "clarify provider agency mission and resources, contributions of their pertinent providers, and major societal influences likely to help or hinder the proposed comprehensive program and progress regarding the problem area" (Knox, 1993, p. 43). The process of contextual analysis (Knox, 1993, p. 482) includes "environmental scanning, future forecasting, and other procedures to understand current and emerging social influences, many of which are implicit and require some analysis to identify and specify their implications for agency planning." Simerly (1987) observed that stakeholders are constantly involved in environmental scanning and this allows them to analyze complex social situations.

Program planning and implementation are synergistic to the extent that key stakeholders are actively involved in the process (Knox, 1993). Stakeholders can serve as powerful agents of change. Furthermore, the perspectives and commitment they develop through participation in program planning and implementation can develop their appreciation of this process as well as develop their leadership capacity (McKenzie, 1991) as evidenced in the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

Identifying Stakeholders

Various approaches to identifying stakeholders in adult education programs have been proposed. Mitroff (1983) recommended the adoption of seven methods to determine the range of stakeholders and further distinguished between intrinsic and extrinsic perspectives. Knox (1982) suggested that three groups be actively involved in program planning; resource persons, potential participants, and administrators. Cervero and Wilson (1992, 1994) named five groups of people that should be represented when planning programs; learners, teachers, planners, the leadership of the organizations involved in the planning process, and the affected public. The most comprehensive listing of stakeholders (Knox, 1993) included instructors, learners, representatives from co-sponsoring agencies, policy makers, supporters from the parent organization and society in general. The stakeholders in the development of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program paralleled Knox's listing except that a delimited segment of society was included, namely, members of ethnocultural communities.

Cervero and Wilson (1994) cautioned that program planners need to be aware of whether stakeholders are truly representative of their constituency. Knox (1993) identified the need for a balance between internal and external members. He stated that the individual members should have "sufficient stature to have the confidence of their constituency and flexibility to make plans; they should not serve as messengers for the real decision-makers in their constituencies" (Knox, 1993, p. 476). The representativeness of the stakeholders in this study was, at times, questioned by the stakeholders and the researcher.

The importance of achieving a balance between stakeholders who are internal and external to the organization was a common theme throughout the literature (Beder, 1987; Cervero, 1992; Cervero and Wilson, 1994; Knox, 1993; Mitroff, 1983). External stakeholders responsible for an educational activity can provide an enriched understanding of societal influences, thereby strengthening the planning process and allowing for reflection, monitoring, and retrospection (Knox, 1993). As Knox suggested:

> The inclusion of external stakeholders (such as policy makers, funders, and cosponsors) in strategic planning can contribute to an understanding of social, political, and economic influences and can increase external support. External stakeholders typically care about adult education as a means to address broader societal issues and specific personal benefits. (p.7)

In community colleges, relationships with external groups are as important as any of the college's internal relationships. It is the quality of these external relationships that will determine the success in developing and offering community-based programs (Gollattscheck, 1983). If the community-based program has very limited benefits to society, such as the Heritage Language

Instructor Training program, external stakeholders may only need to provide advisory and supportive relationships.

External stakeholders can assume multiple and varied roles in program planning and implementation. Such relationships can include mutual involvement in planning, conducting, and evaluating learning experiences. They can vary in formality, complexity, and length of time. The type of relationship which is developed will depend on what is perceived as possible and desirable by the host agency and the stakeholders. Gollattscheck (1981) proposed five types of relationships for external stakeholders: raising awareness; providing advice; offering direct assistance through the provision of services, facilities, expertise and other resources; undertaking a joint venture where duties and obligations of each party are clearly delineated; and, a formal merger where the organizations contract to pool their resources in a long-term cooperative enterprise in which each assumes specific responsibilities and shares in the benefits. The Heritage Language Instructor Training program advisory committee provided opportunity for a balance of stakeholders, both internal and external to the partner organizations, to offer suggestions concerning the program. The external stakeholders fulfilled a variety of roles as identified by Gollatscheck.

Questions of Power

Cervero and Wilson (1994, p. 4) concluded that "planning programs is a social activity in which people negotiate personal and organizational interests."

This process is "conducted within a complex set of personal, organizational and social relationships of power among people who have similar, different, or conflicting sets of interests regarding the program" (Cervero and Wilson, 1994, p. 4). Thus, "pragmatic planners must be able to read organizational power relationships in order to anticipate conflict and provide support in carrying out a vision of planning that is substantively democratic" (Cervero and Wilson, 1994, p. 115). Planners must also recognize that these relationships of power are not fixed and need to be constantly assessed as they evolve. Cervero and Wilson (1994, p. 30) concluded that planners are "always reconstructing the power relationships and interests of everyone involved in planning a program." Forester (1989, 1993) proposed that the questions which planners typically address concerning the purpose, content, audience and form of a program are important, but not essentials to work with or toward. Rather, these questions provide practical and political questions to be defined and reconstructed over time. The power of planners is further restricted by the social and institutional structures within which they work, and where both the planner's discretion and these structural constraints must be integrated into resultant activities (Forester, 1989; Goodson, 1991).

Values and Program Planning

Program planning involves value judgments, such as the selection of desirable goals, client groups and program features. Clearly defining the value base for a program can lead to consistency, coherence, and congruence and to better fit between organizational needs (Simerly, 1987). This process of values clarification may also be required to resolve conflicts and achieve consensus among stakeholders (Knox, 1993). Within a group of stakeholders the value structure evolves over time (Churchman, 1961) and the size and diversity of the group will influence the scope of the values, thus further complicating the process of value clarification. Although adult educators have accepted the notion that every program is value-based the underlying values in continuing education are seldom examined (Merriam, 1982) and little has been written concerning how to address value conflict in adult education.

Griffith (1978, p. 392) advised that "adult educators need to have a coherent value position which gives direction to their work" for in the absence of this, educational programs will be "causally shaped by the interests of those with the most power" (Cervero and Wilson, 1994, p. 140). Some authors have expanded this notion of value position to include the adoption of a philosophical perspective which influences the way in which adult educators and, more specifically, program planners approach their work.

Flannery and Wiselock (1991) provided three reasons why the adoption of a philosophical perspective was vital to the planning and implementation of adult and community education programs. First, adult educators need to develop a philosophy since the philosophy which they have may not fit the learners, the situation, or the organizational context. Second, the philosophy may need to be updated according to new experiences or understandings.

Third, one's philosophy may need to change on the basis of reflection on practice.

Based on the assumption that any educational endeavor is influenced by the philosophical beliefs which orient one's instructional and planning behaviors (Freire, 1971; Looft, 1972), it becomes imperative for adult educators to develop a philosophy of their own. These beliefs and assumptions which guide practice must be made explicit (Schon, 1983). Through this process of examination of such beliefs and assumptions, contradictions and consistencies in practice can be ascertained (Apps, 1973).

In this study, the researcher developed a personal statement of values in an effort to provide focus and sustain her commitment to the project. This value statement was reviewed periodically yet did not change.

Planning Models

Sork and Buskey (1986) determined that since the 1950s more than 100 theories of planning have been added to the adult education literature. The majority of these models describe the process of developing adult education programs in a rather prescriptive manner. Brookfield (1986, p. 2) has proposed that these frameworks are perceived with a healthy level of scepticism by those "with years of experience dealing with organizations in which personality conflicts, political factors, and budget constraints alter neatly conceived plans of action."

Pennington and Green (1976), in their study of 52 continuing professional educators working in higher education institutions, determined that the planning process adopted by these individuals did not match any textbook planning frameworks. They concluded that "personal values, environmental constraints, available resource alternatives, and other factors impinged on the program development process" (Pennington and Green, 1976, p. 22) thus making the adoption of formalized planning models of little use. Sork (1983), in reviewing 22 reports pertaining to program development in continuing professional education published since 1970, found that these documents focused on the "how" rather than the "why" of program development, were highly prescriptive in nature, and gave little recognition to the real world context.

Cervero (1994, p. 115) has concluded that "individual beliefs about learning and education are too complex to permit any single framework to be universally appropriate." He critiques those program development models which continue to be presented within a functionalist framework and are based on the premises that problems can be clearly identified and can be resolved by the application of scientific knowledge. This continued alliance to the classical models of planning with their inherent step-by-step approach, in the opinions of Sork and Cafferella (1989, p. 243) "describes an idealized process that may or may not fit with the realities of practice."

Cervero and Wilson (1994) have suggested that the classical models of program planning exclude aspects of principles, values, and interests. They recommend that the adoption of models with a naturalistic view allows planners to develop the necessary expertise through implementing programs and becoming aware of their criteria for decision-making. These researchers support the adoption of a critical perspective (Carr and Kemmis, 1986; Habbermas, 1971) which assumes that adult educators possess an identifiable set of values which then influence their planning activities. The critical view point affords a more useful way of understanding the process of program development in that it considers situations which are characterized by "uniqueness, uncertainty, or value conflict" (Cervero and Wilson, 1992, p. 128).

By critical reflection on practice (Schon, 1983) it is hoped that program planning theories can be developed which "take into account the exigencies of day-to-day responsibilities of practitioners" (Sork and Cafferela, 1989, p. 243). Adult educators must develop their "own continuing theory of practice under real-time conditions" (Argyris and Schon, 1974, p. 157) and need to view themselves as practical theorists (Brookfield, 1984).

The process of program development and implementation for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program did not follow any formal planning framework or model. Rather, strategies were adopted which recognized the principles, values, and interests of the stakeholders. The dual role of program planner and researcher allowed considerable opportunity for reflective practice over an extended period of time.

Defining Collaboration

Despite the current interest in collaboration in educational activities, confusion exists regarding the meaning of the term collaboration. Mawhinney (1993, p. 7) commented that "in current research, linkages are identified variously as cooperation, collaboration, interagency partnership, or service integration." In particular, the terms cooperation and collaboration are used interchangeably in much of the literature further confusing the interpretation of practice.

Beder (1984, p. 6) defined cooperation as the process of working with other organizations to achieve mutual benefits. He identified four types of cooperation: (1) cosponsorship where two or more agencies jointly offer a program; (2) referral when other organizations and individuals refer learners to the organizing agency; (3) donor-receiver when other organizations make donations to the organizing education agency for charitable or promotional purposes; and, (4) coordination where agencies agree to coordinate activities so as to maximize efficiency and reduce competition.

Hord (1986) distinguished collaboration and cooperation in terms of inputs, operations, process, purposes, and results. In Hord's opinion, cooperation may not result in mutual benefits for all partners whereas collaboration is more likely to result in shared goals, rewards, and a sense of synergy.

In reviewing the interagency partnership process in community education, Cook and Cookingham (1980), named four strategies or linking mechanisms that can be employed to achieve organizational goals; cooperation, coordination, conjoin, and collaboration. Cooperation is based on communication between partner organizations and has the least requirement for formal structure. Coordination infers a level of regulation which is achieved through centralized decision-making and formal, written agreements. Interagency conjoins are designed to address the resolution of specific problems and usually result in the formation of short-term, action-oriented teams. Collaboration requires both formal and informal agreements between organizations and is achieved through long-term comprehensive planning and long-term commitments of energy and time.

Appley and Winder (1977) viewed collaboration as a relational system of individuals within groups, in which:

> 1. individuals in a group share mutual aspirations and a common conceptual framework;
>
> 2. the interactions among individuals are characterized by "justice as fairness";
>
> 3. these aspirations and conceptualizations are characterized by each individual's consciousness of his or her motives toward the other; by caring or concern for the other; and by commitment to work with the other over time provided that this commitment is a matter of choice. (p.281)

In order to maintain a collaborative relationship, both parties must perceive a mutuality of interests and benefits for the relationship (Gollattscheck, 1981). Knox (1982, p. 19) concluded that "the best basis for sustained and mutually beneficial collaboration is a symbiotic relationship based on shared purposes, complementary contributions and shared benefits."

Process of Collaboration

Padak (1993) has proposed that the development of educational partnerships as a means of addressing educational problems is pervasive; yet, despite the growth of this phenomenon the partnership process has not been studied in a comprehensive, systematic fashion. Research concerning partnerships between schools and the business community has provided lists of characteristics of, or requirements for, effective partnerships. These include data pertaining to potential problems in partnerships (Otterbourg and Timpane, 1986), elements of partnerships (Grobe, 1990), critical elements to collaboration (Caplan, 1988), and themes germane to such partnerships (DelPizzo, 1990). Mawhinney (1993) concluded that despite current research on the requirements for effective collaboration, factors which facilitate or interfere with the process remain unclear. This study will present just such factors as perceived by those actively engaged in the collaborative process.

Padak et al. (1993) adopted a socio-cultural approach to the study of educational partnerships by interviewing those directly involved in such activity. Of particular interest to these researchers were the questions of how partnership was defined and what variables prevented the success of partnerships. The findings of their study yielded three major domains of information concerning partnerships: definitions of partnerships, critical features associated with successful partnerships, and potential results of partnerships. Four general categories of factors affecting the success of partnerships emerged: people and relationships, investment and understanding, the partnership framework, and resources. The analysis of the data gathered from stakeholders involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program yielded four similar categories of factors; relationship, process, structure, and resources.

Knox (1982a) suggested that planning for collaborative adult education requires identification of mutual goals, complementary contributions, shared benefits and a compelling vision. In subsequent research, Knox (1993) reaffirmed the essential role of complementary contributions and shared benefits and added the condition of common purpose. The process of determining what each stakeholder considered to be a beneficial exchange in a collaborative relationship was determined to take considerable time.

Melaville (1993) in conducting research with agencies providing programs and services to the community concluded that the adoption of collaborative strategies is the key to systems change. Partners who agree to work together to meet their individual goals without substantially changing the services that they provide or the rules and regulations which govern their institutions is not enough. Collaborative strategies are necessary in which partners share a vision, establish common goals, and agree to use their power to achieve them. Commitment to sharing resources and a willingness to alter existing policies are vital to these strategies.

Benefits of Collaboration

Fox and Faver (1984) identified four benefits in working collaboratively with others: joining resources and dividing labor, alleviating isolation, sustaining motivation through commitments to other collaborators, and creating energy to complete the project through interpersonal relationships. Other benefits of collaborative programs are joint needs assessment and contextual analysis, resource sharing, combined staff development, and a focused public response (Knox, 1993). Collaboration can enhance the stability of an inadequate resource base and help cope with uncertainty. Forest (1981, p. 190) surmised that

> ...resistance will be reduced if administrators, teachers, board members, and community leaders feel that the project is their own not one devised and operated by outsiders; if the project accords with values and ideals which have long been acknowledged by participants; if participants feel that their autonomy and their security are not threatened; and if participants have joined in diagnostic efforts leading them to agree on what the basic problem is and to feel its importance.

Collaboration is a useful strategy for reducing risk since co-sponsorship typically spreads the risk between two or more parties. Community partners can provide substantial experience and credibility with the stakeholders and can affect productive referral relationships.

Beder (1987) viewed collaboration as a competitive tool rather than as a good in its own right. Collaboration is useful in attaining at least five objectives: domain extension, co-optation, cost reduction, risk reduction, and powerful alliances. Domain is the sphere of influence in which the adult education provider is legitimately allowed to operate. Collaboration can provide a legitimate and effective way to expand one's domain as long as one's mission is not compromised by so doing. Through co-optation, the program provider defuses competition by loosely assimilating competitive programs into the organization.

Costs of Collaboration

The benefits of collaboration can appear so great as to blind the parties to the potential hazards (Beder, 1984). The time to negotiate and maintain a collaborative relationship, the loss of autonomy and decision-making authority by the various stakeholders, and the organizational disruption created by the varied ways stakeholders approach the activity are true costs of the process (Knox, 1993).

The time required to establish and maintain effective partnerships is very significant. Beder (1984) warned that if partners are incompatible with regard to organizational operations this can cause organizational dislocation, internal strain and the eventual termination of the relationship. The educational institution may experience goal displacement due to other partners (Beder, 1984).

Fox and Faver (1984) categorized the costs of collaboration into two categories. Process costs include time for communication and negotiation; telephone, postage, and travel costs; and the investment of personal energy and time to sustain the collaborative relationship. Outcome costs include possible delays, evaluation problems, financial dilemmas, and possible loss of quality of work.

Time invested in establishing collaborative relationships may be for questionable return. Mawhinney (1993) found that linkages between organizations in one regard such as personnel or funds do not mean that other bonds exist within these organizations. In effect, those interorganizational partnerships which are based on resource transfers such as money, authority, information, and moral support (Laumann et al., 1978, p. 463) may result in "negligible inter-penetration between the partner organizations." Knox (1982) warned that most relations with other stakeholders do not signify a merger but rather an ongoing cooperative or competitive relationship. Two circumstances improve the opportunities for organizations providing community-based programs to achieve and maintain collaborative working relationships: lower boundary maintenance with community education agencies (Katz and Kahn, 1978) and community groups which traditionally value cooperation (Smith, 1992).

Collaborative Planning Skills

Little research has been conducted concerning the skills required by those planning adult education programs in a collaborative manner. Forester (1989), who has provided the most significant perspectives on planning in collaboration with stakeholder groups, has recommended that planners need three kinds of knowledge and skills to develop adult education programs:

technical knowledge and skills, political knowledge and skills, and ethical knowledge with reference to sociopolitical relationships. He also advised of the need to be sensitive to the linkage between the stakeholders and the resultant program with reference to expressed and real interests. Knox (1989) concluded that adult educators require several areas of proficiency in order to collaborate effectively: (1) the ability to recognize those situations which warrant a collaborative approach; (2) the ability to collaborate effectively with stakeholders; and (3) an understanding of the societal influences on the resulting program.

A review of the literature presented some interesting perspectives concerning the skills which are supportive of collaborative program planning. Adult educators who possess a comparative perspective of program planning have an enhanced ability to analyze the context of society and plan and implement programs more effectively (Bennett, Kidd, and Kulich, 1975; Levine and White, 1986; Titmus, 1989). Houle (1980) has noted that as planners of adult education become more expert, they combine their theoretical knowledge with practical experience to address situations. This acquired wisdom assists programmers in determining appropriate stakeholders. Well developed leadership skills are required to enable stakeholders to deal with change, incomplete information, and interpersonal relations (Knox, 1993).

Adult educators need to have a sense of vision to compel stakeholders to work together (Beckhard and Pritchard, 1992; Senge, 1990) which is based on awareness of context. They must be oriented toward the future, able to understand the role of the parent agency in relation to other stakeholders, and appreciate significant societal influences relative to the program (Knox, 1993).

Working in the context of community education requires the ability to deal with organizational instability and change (Knox, 1993). Adult educators who possess the following characteristics are most likely to be successful in this environment: a sense of direction that helps achieve consensus on desired outcomes among stakeholders with differing values; expertise in decision-making and program development; a low need for power and a willingness to rely on gentle persuasion and influence; being flexible in dealing with differences in goals and preferred procedures; being aware of the needs and aspirations of oneself, staff, policy makers and clientele when engaging in decision making; and, being persistent so that parties to decisions often believe it was their own idea and are committed to making the decision work (Knox, 1993, p. 102). Effective coordination of collaborative community education initiatives requires attention to differences regarding priorities, resource allocation, and dealing with opposition and trade-offs (Knox, 1993, p.29)

Summary

The literature review for this study was conducted over the course of six years. As the focus for the research emerged, readings in a variety of discipline areas were undertaken. Upon the emergence of collaboration as a central theme, a comprehensive survey of the literature describing program collaboration was undertaken. As this chapter has revealed, the collaboration literature still provides "highly esoteric descriptions largely ignoring what many are beginning to recognize as the developmental nature of building strategic alliances" (Astroth, 1992, p.10).

Chapter 3

CONNECTING THE VOICES

The following case study chronicles activities and events pertaining to the Heritage Language Instructor Training program which transpired between October, 1987 and December, 1993. The case study is by no means reflective of all events which occurred during this time period; rather what is presented is based upon documents including minutes of meetings, memoranda, journal notes of the researcher, and notes of personal conversations with stakeholders. A timeline which summarizes these activities and events is provided in Appendix D.

Pseudonyms have been used for the individuals and organizations involved with the program in an effort to provide anonymity yet still convey the human aspect of community education. To ensure that the reader is not confused with the characters, a listing of the "cast" has been provided in Appendix A.

The Heritage Language Instructor Training program was characterized by periods of high activity and periods of relative inactivity. These gaps in activity as presented in the case study are reflective of what actually occurred, not a consequence of incomplete documentation.

Background

Community College is an urban post-secondary institution that grants one year certificates and two year diplomas in a variety of career programs. It also offers the first two years of university transfer courses in several disciplines. The institution serves 4,000 students on a full-time basis and addresses the needs of an additional 40,000 adult learners through a variety of part-time credit and non-credit courses and activities.

The institution has maintained a reputation for providing quality educational programs responsive to community needs. Since 1980, the community education unit of the college has assumed responsibility for the development of programs uniquely designed for learners with specialized needs. This unit prides itself in possessing the most culturally diverse learner population within the college.

In 1987, the senior executive officers of Community College approved the creation of an office that would respond to inquiries received from multicultural and Native communities. The staff members of this newly created office were to provide a clearing-house function and to redirect inquiries to the academic divisions in order that programs be developed. The Heritage Language Instructor Training program was one of the first opportunities for this office to work together with an academic unit in the college to design and implement a program.

Heritage Language Instructor Association (LINGA)

Since 1978, LINGA has acted as an umbrella organization serving ethnic community schools in the northern part of the province. The association provides guidance to instructors teaching approximately thirty languages in more than seventy different community-operated schools. This network is comprised of some 500 instructors and more than 5,000 students.

LINGA has one paid staff member and a volunteer board. It receives funds on an annual basis from both the federal and provincial governments to address issues of concern and interest to heritage language instructors.

Beginning Discussions

In the fall of 1987, members of LINGA first approached Community College to express their interest in developing an instructor training program for their membership. Joe, the executive director of the college's multicultural and Aboriginal program clearing-house, invites Wendy, an administrator in the community education unit, to a meeting to discuss a potential response to this request.

October 1987 - As Wendy drives to the meeting location, she reflects back to an initial meeting with a group of settlement workers, several months before. She wonders whether the tone of this meeting will be similar. Wendy anticipates that the participants will represent a variety of ethnocultural groups. She suspects that this group of heritage language teachers will be equally insistent about receiving credit for their foreign academic credentials. Will they want a course which is accredited? Is there sufficient interest in the community to sustain the activity that they would like to offer?

Joe is hosting the meeting in the main boardroom of the college. The table is massive and the dim lighting causes the faces around the table to fade into the shadows. There are seven heritage language teachers present, one of them is the president of LINGA, the non-profit organization for heritage language instructors. Joe explains his role with the college, the president of LINGA explains the purpose of his organization, and the others all introduce themselves. Wendy explains her role at the college and highlights her experience in designing and implementing educational activities in partnership with community groups.

Gradually, it becomes apparent why LINGA is approaching the college for assistance. For several years they have offered professional development opportunities for their membership in the form of in-service workshops or conferences. The interest of their membership in these activities has been high; however, concern has been expressed that these learning opportunities are not extensive enough to allow mastery of knowledge and skill areas. LINGA would like the college to design a series of courses, perhaps six or at most eight, which will improve the competencies of heritage language teachers in community-operated schools.

Wendy inquires concerning a profile of these heritage language teachers and learns that there are four distinct teacher categories: (a) individuals who are certificated teachers employed in the provincial school system who also teach in community-based heritage language schools; (b) those who were educated and employed as teachers in their native country but whose credentials are not recognized in this province; (c) those who have some pedagogical preparation as teachers but did not work as teachers before immigrating to Canada; and, (d) those individuals who have no preparation as teachers, with the possible exception of participating in professional development activities offered by LINGA.

The majority of these people are teaching heritage language classes on a voluntary basis so it is stressed by the LINGA executive that the tuition fees for courses must be minimal. Apparently, consultants with both the federal and provincial government departments responsible for multiculturalism have expressed interest in funding an initiative which will better prepare these community-based heritage language teachers.

Mixed Messages

Several months pass without further interaction between LINGA members and the college. There is a change in the executive of LINGA and the proposed instructor training program appears to have become a lesser priority.

January 13, 1988 - Joe and Wendy meet with four executive members of LINGA to discuss the proposal for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. It is agreed that the curriculum will address the needs of heritage language instructors teaching beginner and intermediate level students, with four courses being developed for each student group. The possibility of offering advanced level courses at a future date is also discussed.

Janet and Tim, LINGA executive members, reiterate the importance of minimal tuition fees and recommend that a grant be secured to defray the costs of delivering the courses. It is agreed by all that community input is critical to this project and LINGA members will be involved with the needs identification process. They will participate in the program advisory committee and possibly instruct some of the courses.

Wendy agrees to work with interested LINGA members to develop a proposal for the program which will be submitted to the appropriate federal and provincial government departments. The first course in the series is proposed for September, 1989.

August 3, 1988 - Joe and Wendy draft the proposal for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Joe clearly specifies the monies he would like to receive for his services, given that he claims responsibility for "planting the seed" for this project in the minds of the LINGA executive. He suggests that the personal relationships which he has with various leaders in the ethnocultural communities will provide further legitimacy for this project.

September 8, 1988 - Wendy and Joe meet to further review the proposal and Joe suggests an increase in the amount of monies for his services. Wendy agrees but indicates that this amount will be reviewed in subsequent proposals. Joe informs Wendy that he has spoken with Ken and Karen, two government consultants, and has been promised resources for the project.

September 29, 1988 - Last evening LINGA held a general meeting of its membership with the specific purpose of soliciting feedback concerning the proposed Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Wendy was unable to attend the meeting; however, Joe was present to represent the college.

This morning, during a telephone conversation, Joe informs Wendy that approximately 60 heritage language instructors attended the meeting. It became apparent that much of the group held false impressions about the intention of the proposed program. Between one third and one half of the group thought that by completing the Heritage Language Instructor Training courses their foreign teaching credentials would be recognized, entitling them to teach legally in the province. Joe told the group that this was not possible but that the college would keep the teacher accreditation body updated concerning the courses.

Other concerns expressed were that these courses address the needs of the majority of LINGA members namely native speakers of heritage languages with limited English proficiency. Due to the limited incomes of these teachers it was requested that tuition fees be minimal. It was recommended that an advisory committee with representatives from LINGA be formed to provide advice throughout the project.

Joe indicates that, overall, there was support expressed for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. He suggests that the level of anger and frustration expressed by those heritage language instructors who have been unsuccessful at having their foreign credentials recognized will continue to grow.

Joe advises Wendy that, based on discussions to date with federal and provincial government consultants, he has a **firm** commitment for a $20,000 to $30,000 grant each year for a two year period.

October 25, 1988 - Since Wendy will be responsible for submitting the proposal for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, she decides to meet with Karen, the provincial government consultant and confirm what Joe has been saying about the level of commitment from her department. They meet and have an informal discussion about timelines and program outcomes. Karen suggests that it is **too early** to prepare a written proposal. She comments that LINGA needs more time to accept this proposal as **their** priority. **She provides no indication of funds available to support such a proposal**.

December 14, 1988 - Wendy is surprised to receive copies of letters which Joe has sent to both Karen and Ken (the federal government consultant) indicating his support of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program proposal (which has not yet been submitted).

Developing the Response

Several months pass without further discussion concerning the proposed program. In late February, 1989 Wendy receives a call from Janet, the president of LINGA, indicating that the executive of LINGA wish to proceed with the proposal and they want to meet with college staff.

March 18, 1989 - At this evening's meeting with the executive of LINGA, and Ken and Karen (the government consultants), Joe and Wendy agreed to a schedule of activities for the 1989/1990 fiscal year. Wendy has very mixed feelings about the outcome of this meeting as her journal notes for the day reflect.

> I think that it helped to draft a timeline on paper, it provided some focus. The executive of LINGA is not familiar with working with a college in planning such a large project. I feel that we are all committed to the same outcome, but I'm not sure that everyone will be able to devote sufficient time to meet our goals.
>
> I continue to be amazed at the level of enthusiasm and energy of the LINGA executive. I need to work very carefully with Joe so that we have a clear understanding of what the project requires and who is responsible for action.

March 20, 1989 - Today Wendy submits a preliminary proposal to both the federal and provincial consultants (Ken and Karen) for the development of the Heritage Language Instructor training program curriculum and the offering of the first course in the program. **Sixteen months** have passed since the initial meeting to prepare this proposal.

April 23, 1989 - This morning Wendy meets with Janet and Judy (of LINGA) to clarify the responsibilities of LINGA and the college in this project. Judy appears to be extremely conscientious and is determined to keep the LINGA executive "on task".

April 25, 1989 - Wendy meets with Joe to further discuss the role of his office with this project and, once again, his expectations for payment for his services. It is evident that he is quite concerned about securing funds to cover the costs of operating his office.

Moving Ahead

June 7, 1989 - This evening the first meeting of the advisory committee for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program is held. The committee is comprised of two members of the executive of LINGA, two heritage language instructors, Karen and Ken (the government consultants), Joe, Anne, and Wendy (from the college) and Bill, the representative from the local university. The terms of reference for the committee are presented and accepted (see Appendix E). It is recommended that a heritage language instructor from the northern region of the province be added to the committee, as well as a representative from the provincial department of education.

The committee is informed that funding for the project has been secured from the federal government; however, funding arrangements with the provincial government are still not finalized. A subsequent meeting is planned to resolve this matter, which has been outstanding since March. It is agreed that ownership of the materials developed will reside with LINGA. A selection committee is struck to interview prospective candidates for the curriculum developer position. It is recommended that the successful candidate, in addition to possessing demonstrated skills in curriculum development, language instruction, and teacher education, be familiar with community-operated heritage language schools.

At the meeting it is also agreed that those actively teaching in a heritage language school and LINGA members be given priority to attend courses.

Concern is expressed by Karen, the provincial government consultant, that only heritage language teachers who are LINGA members should be attending the classes since funding for the project is being given directly to LINGA.

June 1989 - During this month Wendy has several discussions with Karen concerning funding for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Karen seems quite committed to doing something to assist the skill development of the instructors in the community schools. She still prefers to wait until the idea is more fully developed before approval of a **formal** proposal. Wendy's discussions with Joe have become tense. He thinks that a full- fledged formal proposal should be submitted **immediately** in order to ensure that the funds are available.

June 15, 1989 - The advertisement for the curriculum developer position is posted in the local newspaper.

All Is Not As It Appears

Joe has continued to raise concerns about the funds available through the provincial government. Wendy has attempted, on numerous occasions during the past two months, to arrange a meeting with Karen to discuss this matter but has been unsuccessful.

August 25, 1989 - Today, Wendy meets with Karen concerning funding for the project. When Wendy arrives at Karen's office she is informed that Karen is not yet back from lunch. When Karen returns, twenty minutes after the appointed time, she quips, "I didn't think that anyone would be working on such a sunny day." She then proceeds to inform Wendy that she has been transferred to another city and recommends that she meet with John, who will be assuming her former responsibilities. John indicates that he has no idea what the Heritage Language Instructor Training program is about but that Karen has told him to approve funding for it. Wendy is extremely frustrated by the end of her meeting with John as her journal notes reflect:

> I **cannot** believe that John was not better briefed concerning this project. He appears very interested and committed to the project so I think this will be an advantage. Karen had just too much work to do. I am concerned that John is based in another city - access may be a problem. It would be preferable to have in-person meetings, and I was assured that the government budget will support such travel. What a relief to have a promise that the funds will be available. I suspect that Karen would have preferred to leave town without meeting with me.

September 8, 1989 - This evening the committee interviews three of the eight applicants who applied for the curriculum developer position. All three candidates have experience as a language teacher, as a consultant, and as a curriculum developer. Joan is hired because of her extensive publishing record, her strong academic background, and her genuine enthusiasm about the project.

September 29, 1989 - The second advisory committee meeting is held. Once again project funding is on the agenda, with the commitment from the province still to be confirmed.

Joan is introduced as the newly hired curriculum developer. She is known to many of the advisory committee members and is warmly welcomed.

Kate, the college staff member who will be conducting the DACUM workshop, explains the process and answers questions from the group. Criteria are presented to assist with the selection of members of the DACUM committee.

The project timeline is reviewed and modified. The original timeline for activities has now been moved ahead by three months. Following the meeting, Wendy records these comments in her journal:

> Tonight's meeting ran more smoothly than anticipated. The committee appeared to accept the new representative from the department of education. We were 'top-heavy' with non-voting members this evening and several times I had to remind the chair of who could speak to an agenda item as compared with who could vote on a matter. The group appeared quite excited about the upcoming DACUM workshop and I anticipate that several will attend to observe the process. No concerns were expressed concerning the three month delay in activities.

Creating the Product

October 3, 1989 - Today Wendy meets with Kate to further discuss the upcoming DACUM workshop. Wendy will co-facilitate the session since Kate is concerned that she will not understand the spoken English of the participants.

October 25, 1989 - The purpose of this evening's meeting between five LINGA members, Kate and Wendy is to develop a list of participants for the DACUM workshop. After considerable discussion, it is agreed that these individuals should be actively involved in heritage language education, with a minimum of three to five years experience as a heritage language instructor. A concern is expressed that if these teachers are too experienced they will have forgotten what it is like to be nervous about teaching. The group also indicates that there should be a balance between certificated (through the provincial teachers' association) and non-certificated teachers.

There is a lengthy discussion about what constitutes a "good" heritage language instructor. The criteria established by the advisory committee members, to be considered in the selection of the DACUM workshop participants, are ratified. After much debate (one and one half hours) a list of 12 potential participants is developed.

Following the meeting, Wendy chats with Kate about the dynamics and outcomes of the meeting. Kate offers the following commentary:

> Wow, what a transition. The group appeared so amenable during the review of the criteria for selection. But when it came to suggesting names of participants, the mood changed. I hope that we got the best people for the job, not the most political. I do have some concerns about the technical nature of the language we use to conduct these workshops, so I'll do some thinking on this before the workshop. If the participants they selected are half as eager as the executive of LINGA is about this project, it will be a great session.

November 24 & 25, 1989 - The DACUM workshop takes place. Four men and eight women, representing six different languages, are participants. Five of the participants have taught in a community-operated heritage language school for two to three years, five have taught for four to nine years, and two have taught for over 10 years.

There is an air of apprehension on Friday evening which gradually dissipates as Kate, the workshop facilitator, explains the task to the group. One female participant is very aggressive during the first hour and, at coffee break, Kate indicates to Wendy that this woman should be asked to leave. Fate intervenes and the woman decides on her own to leave the workshop. She tells Wendy that she cannot participate since, having recently completed her Bachelor of Education degree, she feels alienated from the others in the group. She adds that her views of education have changed too much since her days as a heritage language instructor in a community school. Ironically, of the group of participants, four are certificated teachers (in accordance with provincial legislation) and five were teachers in their country of origin.

By the end of the workshop, the participants have generated a list of **96** competencies required by a heritage language instructor working in a community school. At the end of the workshop, Kate shares her observations of how the group functioned:

> They were **fantastic**. I know that we will have to refine the wording on some of the task and duty areas but I have never worked with a group who pushed so hard to exhaust the possibilities. I'm glad you were here to help interpret the English when I couldn't understand someone. In all the years that I have done DACUM workshops, this was the best - it really showed the strength of the process!

December 1989 - Kate, Joan and Wendy meet twice this month to further refine the competency profile chart. In light of all the areas that were identified, it is agreed that some will have to be addressed in an advanced level of the curriculum. A copy of the completed competency profile chart (see Appendix F) is mailed to the DACUM workshop participants in order that they may recommend changes.

Questioning the Response

January 3, 1990 - Joe continues to send Wendy information on heritage language initiatives from across Canada, always accompanied by a note stressing the high profile of these other activities. He clearly views this project as a 'feather in the college's cap' which he can use when competing for the position of hosting authority for the Canadian Heritage Language Institute.

January 12, 1990 - Joe calls Wendy this morning and after a lengthy discussion it becomes evident that he is questioning the appropriateness of using the DACUM process, given the English literacy levels of the participants in the workshop. Wendy assures him that Kate has extensive experience in the area and that this factor was given consideration in conducting the workshop and developing the competency profile. She adds that this process has been used internationally and is often used in assessing vocational skill areas where the literacy levels of the participants are low.

January 19, 1990 - Today at a meeting to review the progress that Joan, the curriculum developer, has made in designing the courses, Joe expresses concern that the quality of the program developed may be compromised by the low literacy level of the DACUM participants. In order that this program be recognized by the Canadian Heritage Language Institute, he wants to ensure that the curriculum will be acceptable to academics in the field. Joan assures Joe that, as an academic, she will ensure that the program meets the necessary standards of academic rigor.

Wendy recommends the use of the term "instructor" rather than "teacher" for this project, so as not to cause concern about the college becoming involved in teacher training which is the exclusive domain of the university.

It is agreed that the courses (see Appendix G for listing) will be offered in a protracted format. Out-of-class assignments will be required and evaluated but that there will be no formal examinations and grades will not be awarded. It is recommended that all courses in the program be offered within a two year period.

Joe expresses a very strong wish that the courses be considered for university transfer status. Wendy later expresses her frustration with this meeting in her journal:

> This whole area of credit versus non-credit programs at our college is so confusing. Joe really wants profile and status from this project but making the program credit is unrealistic. I think in many ways he would have preferred to broker the program from a neighbouring province. At least he is the only one who does not appear excited about the approach we took to develop a curriculum responsive to local needs. I hope that his attitude does not adversely affect the advisory committee.

People Make the Difference

January 25, 1990 - The DACUM workshop participants have begun to return their validated DACUM charts. Of the 10 charts that have been returned, only one has suggestions for changes which require rearranging the order of the bands of competence, or changing the priority levels of the skill sets. This ratio of recommendations for changes is consistent with other DACUM workshops.

January 30, 1990 - John, the provincial government consultant, continues to be excited about the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. He has voluntarily provided Wendy with numerous government position papers, research studies, and other reports commissioned by the province. He is really committed to the success of this pilot project.

February 1, 1990 - Today Wendy meets with Lynn who conducted a needs assessment for heritage language schools in the province. Through questionnaires, interviews, and site visits a number of conclusions and recommendations were developed. The provincial government consultants have praised the calibre of this study. In listening to Lynn describe the research process, Wendy realizes that religious artifacts and practices were not respected and individual's personal space needs were violated. Wendy suspects that this may have implications when conducting research in the same community.

February 8, 1990 - Judy, the executive assistant for LINGA phones and says that she is anxiously awaiting the receipt of the federal and provincial government contracts (for the period April, 1989 to March, 1990). She also requests additional brochures for the first course in the program which starts in one month. Judy has received numerous inquiries about the course and has been actively promoting the program (see Appendix G for a description of the program).

February 14, 1990 - Janet and Judy of LINGA advise Wendy that Lynn exhibited culturally inappropriate behaviors in at least two schools while conducting her research. In their opinion, it may be a long time before the heritage language instructors will welcome a researcher in their classrooms.

Concerns About Resources

February 16, 1990 - Wendy sends a fax to John, the provincial government consultant, which describes the activities conducted for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program for the period April 1, 1989 to March 31, 1990 together with an invoice for these services. The college **has yet to receive any payment since the commencement of the project**.

At this evening's advisory committee meeting, there is considerable discussion concerning the transferability of these courses to other institutions. It is evident that neither university in the province is eager to implement a credit program for these instructors, although this is still viewed as the ideal by several stakeholders. It was agreed that discussions with LINGA's sister organization in the southern region of the province (TINGA) should be continued since they have expressed interest in having the Heritage Language Instructor Training program offered in their area.

March 5, 1990 - Wendy meets with the executive of LINGA to discuss funding for the project. Concern is expressed by all about the $5.9 million reduction in the federal government budget which supports multicultural programs, including heritage language education. A new federal department to address multicultural initiatives has been established. The plan is to open the National Heritage Language Institute this spring. Ken, the federal government consultant, advises Janet (LINGA president) that, as a result of these changes, resources can only be accessed through six recognized umbrella organizations (LINGA being one of these) and will be available for large projects only.

Need for Clarification

March 7, 1990 - Wendy faxes information to John concerning copyright options for the curriculum syllabus. Her preference is that the curriculum syllabus be the property of the government department providing the resources for its development, and the college and LINGA have the right to its use. Although the program advisory committee agreed in June, 1989 that the copyright should be held by LINGA, the government solicitor disagrees.

First Course is Offered

March 8, 1990 - Since the first course starts this evening, Wendy did not attend the meeting with the LINGA executive and John, the provincial government consultant, to discuss copyright issues and the contract for funding. **Twenty eight** months have passed since the first meeting to discuss developing and implementing these courses.

Things are rather chaotic this first evening of class. There is a line-up of people waiting to register for the course, since only **one** of the 26 students has registered in advance of the class. It is 10 minutes past the time when the class is to start and the instructor has not yet arrived.

Initially, there is very little interaction among the students except for those who are from the same heritage language school. By the end of the evening, all of the students have worked with each other and are more actively participating.

Wendy explains to the students her role at the college and her interest in studying this project for her doctoral research. One student expresses concern about this research given a previous incident where a researcher with the provincial government touched materials which were considered sacred. Wendy acknowledges this concern and clarifies that she will not be visiting the community schools.

Clarification Continues

March 9, 1990 - John, the provincial government consultant, telephones Wendy to say that he is having difficulty understanding who holds copyright to the curriculum syllabus. Wendy discusses the matter with him for several minutes but at the end of the conversation suspects that he was still confused.

March 12, 1990 - Wendy spends most of the day working on the proposal and contract for the request for funding for the provincial government. The solicitor with the provincial government department has requested that a formal contract be developed and signed before the monies owing for the project are released. The provincial government now wants sole ownership of the curriculum syllabus.

Joan telephones Wendy to say that she has been approached by Tina, a faculty member at a university in the southern region of the province, to discuss potential courses in the area of heritage languages. Joan suspects that Tina is concerned that registrations in the graduate level courses for heritage language teachers, currently offered by the university, will decrease if the Heritage Language Instructor Training program is offered in the area by TINGA.

March 13, 1990 - Yet **another** evening meeting to discuss the contract with the provincial government for funding for the project. John is 40 minutes late for the meeting and people are losing patience (despite the fact that he did telephone to indicate that he would be late).

John informs us that TINGA is very interested in having the courses delivered in their city and that Tina, a university faculty member, has expressed concern that this will decrease the number of TINGA members registering in the four graduate level courses offered at the local university. Moreover, he states that Tina has accused Community College of stealing her curriculum.

John advises that the amount of support for the project for the 1990/1991 fiscal year should be known by the end of the month. He has incorporated a clause in the contract which specifies continued financial support to the completion of the project since he is concerned about the availability of funds in the future.

March 14, 1990 - LINGA hosts a general meeting to discuss the implications of the loss of federal funds to support the operation of community-based heritage language schools. Forty-five LINGA members attend and express strong concerns about the future of heritage language education in Canada.

John reports that the provincial government is striking a task force to study the question of heritage language education. Three priorities for projects that will be supported by the province have been identified: (a) projects that assist the public in understanding and adopting principles of multiculturalism; (b) projects that assist the public to adopt principles of multiculturalism relative to employment equity; and, (c) projects that assist members of ethnocultural communities to participate in society. This reflects a move away from the cultural retention focus and LINGA members question the effect of these priorities upon the level of support for heritage language education.

Wendy provides an update on the Heritage Language Instructor Training program and answers questions. Two participants in the DACUM workshop are excited that the courses are being offered and indicate that they have been recommending the program to friends and colleagues. At the end of the meeting, 15 people approach Wendy to inquire about upcoming courses.

March 18, 1990 - Wendy and Joan meet for the second time this month to discuss the curriculum syllabus. Joan is struggling with the format for the document and states that only by teaching the courses will she be able to determine what level of detail is required. Wendy expresses concern that adopting this approach may place too much pressure on her in light of the time she has available.

March 23, 1990 - This is the fourth advisory committee meeting and Ken, the federal government consultant, has appeared for the first time. It soon becomes apparent that he had not read the minutes of previous meetings and so time is required to 'bring him on board'. The question of copyright of the curriculum syllabus is **finally** resolved, with LINGA and the provincial government sharing ownership. The college can use the materials in whole or in part, subject to an annual review by these two parties.

Two policies are ratified. Priority for registration in the courses will be given to LINGA members who are active heritage language instructors (as recommended in June, 1989). As well, 100 percent attendance by the learners is required to successfully complete the courses.

March 24, 1990 - John telephones with a suggested change to the contract for funding for the project. He expresses anger at the recent cuts in federal funds. He has been unable to reach Ken, the federal government consultant, to discuss the consequences for the joint funding of the Heritage Language Instructor Training project for the 1990/1991 fiscal year. John is concerned that the cuts to the operating grants for the community schools by the federal government may result in the closure of some heritage language schools and consequently a reduction in the number of participants in the instructor training program.

Missed Opportunities

March 31, 1990 - Because the 1989/90 funding contract with the provincial government is still not signed, LINGA cannot submit a proposal to fund the Heritage Language Instructor Training program for 1990/91. This requires that the funds to support the program will have to be drawn from the organization's general operating budget.

May 8, 1990 - The second offering of the Developing Classroom Material course is cancelled due to low registrations.

Politics Prevail

June 14, 1990 - Joe telephones Wendy to say that he is continuing to lobby for the college to host the Canadian Heritage Language Institute. Representatives from LINGA have presented a strong argument to have the institute housed locally; however, Joe is concerned that the university will be chosen as host site rather than the college.

John telephones Wendy to advise her that Tina is still expressing concern that the college stole her curriculum. She is very upset that TINGA wants to use LINGA's curriculum, not the one which she has developed for the local university.

June 26, 1990 - LINGA hosts a meeting with presentations by three consultants from the department of education concerning locally developed language and culture programs. Janet raises two concerns with the consultants. One is a suggestion by the federal minister of multiculturalism that provincial departments of education will serve heritage language needs; the other is that such a takeover could be the demise of heritage language education. The consultants state that they are not aware of this movement.

June 28, 1990 - The fifth advisory committee meeting takes place. At the November, 1989 meeting of the advisory committee the concept of training peer evaluators/mentors was discussed. Joan suggests that we need to give consideration to the training of instructors to deliver the Heritage Language Instructor Training curriculum. Joan comments,

> It has become evident that if we are to continue to deliver these courses we need to increase our cadre of instructors and I think that the graduates of the program may provide such a resource with some further development.

A lengthy discussion takes place concerning how to ensure the continuance of this instructor training initiative. The members of the committee unanimously agree that the government will not support the program forever and that a way is needed to offer the curriculum effectively and economically, using local resources. There is general support for the development of a train the trainers curriculum.

July 11, 1990 - Today, Wendy spends seven hours with Janet and Judy of LINGA preparing two evaluation reports and two proposals for the project. Janet expresses concern about the adverse psychological effects of the reduction in federal funding for heritage language schools. She suspects that this situation may cause heritage language instructors to lose interest in taking courses to improve their skills.

Delays in Production

July 26, 1990 - Wendy meets with Joan who is still experiencing difficulty with determining the format for the curriculum syllabus. Joan states that she does not want to prescribe or dictate approaches, although she recognizes that this detail is critical to the syllabus being used successfully by others. The document is becoming much longer than anticipated.

July 30, 1990 - Wendy advises Janet and Judy of LINGA that the DACUM chart will be completed and forwarded within the next few days and that Joan has been given a deadline of August 31 by which to complete the curriculum syllabus.

August 10, 1990 - Judy phoned Wendy to praise an article she has written about the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Judy is concerned about provincial government funding for the upcoming national conference on heritage languages and is also nervous about the funding for the Heritage Language Instructor Training courses. She questions whether the curriculum syllabus will be completed as planned and the consequences that a delay may have upon the release of monies from the provincial government.

Financial Concerns

The college has yet to receive payment from the provincial government for services provided during the period April 1989 to March 1990. This outstanding invoice was brought to the attention of the financial officers of the college during the institutional audit performed at the end of June.

August 19, 1990 - Wendy receives a telephone call from a manager in the college's finance department this morning, inquiring when monies owing to the college for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program will be received. Wendy explains that LINGA cannot pay the invoice until the funds are received from the provincial government and the manager threatens to garnishee her wages for the outstanding amount.

Changes in Staff

September to December, 1990 - Wendy is on a leave of absence to pursue doctoral studies at the university. She agrees to maintain her involvement with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program and Anne assumes responsibility for the day-to-day operation of the project. Wendy continues to work with the LINGA executive, the advisory committee, and to visit the classroom.

Judy leaves her position with LINGA in September and Janet's sister assumes these responsibilities on a part-time, interim basis. Anne leaves the college in December. Judy and Anne were involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training project for the past one and one half years and were the two individuals who ensured that the day-to-day operations went smoothly from the perspective of LINGA and the college.

The Politics Continue

October 3, 1990 - Tonight there are two guest speakers at the LINGA meeting, the assistant deputy minister of the provincial government department responsible for multiculturalism and the director of language services with the department of education. Both speak of the importance of heritage language education to society. The assistant deputy minister stresses the role of heritage language education in cultural retention, identity, and economic development. He indicates that his department is currently reviewing its strategy concerning language education and determining where responsibility for this area best resides. He adds that in other provinces, heritage language education has been moved into the jurisdiction of the provincial department of education. The director from the department of education comments that the establishment of the Canadian Heritage Language Institute will provide a "backbone" for heritage language education and although his department is supportive of such language education, resources are not currently available to respond to community needs.

October 19-21, 1990 - LINGA hosts a very successful national heritage language conference. It is anticipated that an announcement will be made by a senior level federal government official concerning the Canadian Heritage Language Institute, but no information is released. The value of heritage languages for cultural and economic development in a global village is a common theme. Many speak of the need to develop strategies to advocate for the continued growth of heritage languages in times of declining resources.

Janet, Joan, and Wendy present information about the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Interest in the initiative is high, particularly among heritage language instructors in provinces where resources are not available to prepare instructors. Two LINGA members, who are still very angry at not having their teaching credentials recognized in Canada, wage an attack on the program, insisting that the focus should be preparing teachers for certification. Several heritage language instructors in the audience refute this argument, suggesting that there are already sufficient Bachelor of Education programs in Canada to address this need.

Changing Parameters

October 25, 1990 - Wendy meets with Joan who explains that she will be out of the country for several weeks and will not be able to complete the curriculum syllabus until the end of November.

November 29, 1990 - At this evening's advisory committee meeting, it becomes evident that there is much confusion within the provincial government concerning mandates, programs, and roles of consultants. Both John and Ben (provincial government consultants) are present and provide two different messages concerning the future of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. John assures the committee members that the project will continue, no matter what he has to do to make this happen. Ben is more guarded in his comments and suggests that funds are limited and competition for scarce resources is high.

January 7, 1991 - The first draft of the curriculum syllabus is submitted to John, four months later than planned.

Increasing Profile

January 28, 1991 - In response to a request received from the federal Minister for Multiculturalism, Community College's vice-president academic submits Wendy's name as a potential nominee for the board of the Canadian Heritage Language Institute.

March 6, 1991 - LINGA makes a presentation to the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future (the Spicer Commission). The value of heritage language education and a national institute for heritage languages is emphasized.

Clarifying Expectations

June 27, 1991 - Wendy writes to John asking when the outstanding monies from the province will be released. The auditors and the financial officer at the college are becoming very concerned about this matter and are phoning her every few days.

July 23, 1991 - A meeting is held with the LINGA executive, three government consultants (Ken, John, Ben), and Wendy to discuss concerns about the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. It appears that the LINGA representatives had met in advance with John and Ben. John is present to ensure continuity on the project and Ben as the new consultant for LINGA who also wants to learn more about the program. Concerns are expressed about the draft nature of the curriculum syllabus which was submitted to John. He asks for the inclusion of credits and background information, a more consistent format for the document, and to have the document laser printed. Wendy agrees to these changes.

August 23, 1991 - Attenders of the July 23 meeting reconvene with the addition of Amy who will be assuming responsibility for the project during Wendy's upcoming leave of absence. All are satisfied with the changes which have been made to the curriculum syllabus, and ask that student materials be included in the document. John and Ben indicate uncertainty in terms of what resources will be available through the provincial government in the future. The Canadian Heritage Language Institute is scheduled to open in October and the consultants state that this may cause a further review of the value of the province's allocating resources to heritage language education.

September 1991 - There has been a change in college policy and without a signed financial contract, no program activities can occur. Nine months have passed since the last course was offered. The college financial officer will not allow further courses to be offered until LINGA has made a partial payment of monies owed to the college.

October 5, 1991 - TINGA again declares their interest in offering the Heritage Language Instructor Training program in the southern part of the province during 1992/93.

October 13, 1991 - Joan, the curriculum developer, submits to Amy a computer disk containing the curriculum syllabus (including student materials).

October 25, 1991 - Almost a year has passed since the last advisory committee meeting. In order to maximize the number of learners who can access the courses, it is agreed to let learners register for courses without having completed the pre-requisite course. It is agreed that more effort is required to promote the courses in the community and across Canada. Two donations of resource materials have been received, one from Joan and the other from the provincial government. The provincial government has appointed a new committee to study multicultural issues in the province and substantial concern is expressed that language education, in particular heritage language education, is not represented.

After the meeting, Wendy makes the following notations about the behaviors of certain advisory committee members,

> John is still very committed to the project and is desperate to send the outstanding payment before it is reallocated to some other project in government. He is prepared to push for representation of heritage language education on the newly formed "think tank" committee but feels that the appointment of this committee was purely political and his voice will not be listened to.
>
> Joe is "playing his cards close to his chest". He denies knowledge of what is happening with the Canadian Heritage Language Institute, although he clearly states that he is still communicating with people in Ottawa and Toronto concerning its status. He does not appear to know what the provincial government is doing these days.

November 14, 1991 - Amy telephones Wendy to advise her that the curriculum syllabus has been forwarded to John with a letter requesting release of the outstanding funds.

November 25, 1991 - Amy telephones Sue, the provincial government consultant, to inquire about the release of funds. Sue indicates that the cheque was not issued because LINGA has not sent a letter to John indicating the project is completed. The letter sent to John by the college along with the curriculum syllabus is insufficient.

November 29, 1991 - On behalf of LINGA, Janet sends a letter to John indicating that the curriculum syllabus is complete and that the funds being withheld should be released.

January 3, 1992 - The monies have still not been released. The letter which was sent by Janet was unclear in its wording, so another letter is sent.

January 1992 - There is extensive media coverage of a statement made by the provincial Premier denouncing French language education. Several of the learners in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program express concern about the effect of this statement upon heritage language education.

January 30, 1992 - Wendy calls Amy to inquire why the advisory committee meeting was cancelled. Amy decided to cancel it because there was no business to discuss. Janet, LINGA president, wanted the committee to meet to discuss funding but Amy refused and agreed to meet with Janet separately to work on the 1992/93 funding applications.

The outstanding cheque from the provincial government has not arrived yet. John, the provincial government consultant, has told Janet that it is 'in the works'. LINGA has signed a contract with the college and paid the outstanding invoice by borrowing against their term deposit.

February 7, 1992 - Wendy meets with Amy who is concerned that only two students have registered for the next course. She anticipates about 13 people will register, probably on the evening of the first class.

Tim, an executive member of LINGA, has volunteered to assist with ordering resources for the library and he wants to meet with Amy on another matter. Wendy comments that Tim has been very quiet around her as of late and she's not sure why.

February 29, 1992 - The finance department of the college is concerned about the financial viability of the project. Amy is warned that in the future she will not be able to commence such an activity without a signed contract.

March 7, 1992 - Wendy attends the joint planning meeting of LINGA and TINGA. The Canadian Heritage Language Institute is now on an indefinite hold. Some members of TINGA prefer to broker the Heritage Language Instructor Training program through a local community college while others favor doing so through the university. Sue, the provincial government consultant, states that the provincial government will not support the creation of yet another heritage language instructor training curriculum.

April 3, 1992 - The major focus of discussion at this evening's advisory committee meeting is funding for the program. The 1989/90 contract with the provincial government is not yet signed. The federal government consultant, Ken, advises that LINGA should include the Heritage Language Instructor Training program as part of their three year plan since he doubts that the project will meet with the new criteria for innovative projects. Sue says that she met with John today and he is still very concerned about the financial support for the continuance of this project.

Now that graduation time is approaching there is some disagreement about the 100 percent attendance policy which was approved in March, 1990. Three of the potential graduates have missed one or two classes, although they have completed all of their assignments. It is agreed that the attendance records will be reviewed and that the instructors will make a recommendation for the consideration of the college administrative staff.

There is considerable discussion about the potential for the courses to be offered by TINGA in the southern region of the province. The advisory committee members stress the importance of finding an appropriate host educational institution in this area which will not revise the curriculum.

April 13, 1992 - Wendy attends a LINGA executive meeting with Sue, the provincial government consultant. Sue indicates that the pilot project has been completed so LINGA needs to clearly state what the next stage will be. An evaluation component for this project is required in the three year plan presented by LINGA. Three elements should be incorporated in the 1992/93 plan, namely program evaluation, curriculum revision, and program delivery. It would also be helpful to assess the demand for this curriculum in a distance education format. A plan to train the trainers should also be included in 1992/93 proposal.

At the end of the meeting Janet asks Wendy to contact Amy to set up a meeting to discuss the proposal for funding which needs to be submitted to Sue by the end of the month. Wendy feels very awkward with this request since she only attended this meeting because Amy was out of town.

April 14, 1992 - Wendy receives a copy of TINGA's three year plan which indicates that $8,000 has been requested to implement the teacher training courses in cooperation with the college in 1993/94. This figure was developed without consultation with college staff or LINGA executive members.

Amy receives a telephone call from Joan who wants to discuss concerns which she has about 'bending the rules' so that certain students can graduate. Wendy advises Amy not to get 'caught in the middle' on this one and to only discuss this matter with both Janet and Joan present.

April 15, 1992 - Amy calls Wendy to discuss some points concerning funding for the project. She indicates that the staff in the finance department at the college are skeptical whether the outstanding funds, which have now been returned to the provincial treasury, will ever be received. Amy does not want to include funds for Joe's office in the current proposal since she feels strongly that he is no longer actively involved in the project. She plans to reduce the hourly rate of pay for instructors from 50 dollars per hour to 30 dollars per hour, given that the curriculum is now developed. She has received some resistance from Janet on this point who thinks that Joan will not teach for such a lesser salary.

Janet advises Amy and Wendy that the heritage language conference in a neighbouring province was excellent. She was very surprised to meet Tina at this conference, who, she adds, "stood out like a neon sign." Tina commented that her participation at the conference was appropriate in light of her future intentions to be actively involved with heritage language instructor training in the southern portion of the province.

April 22, 1992 - Wendy telephones Amy to determine if everything is in order for the proposal. She indicates that the last of the details have been added and thanks Wendy for assisting with the meetings last week. Amy expresses how difficult it has been to be accepted as the college staff member responsible for this project. She indicates that people have been very polite to her but she has not developed the depth of rapport that Wendy has been able to over the course of several years.

Spreading the Word

May 8, 1992 - A presentation at the joint conference of the national association of second language teachers and the modern language council of the provincial teachers' association generates considerable interest in the program.

May, 1992 - Twenty two months later the outstanding funds are released by the provincial government to LINGA and the organization pays the monies owed to the college.

June, 1992 - The graduation ceremony is postponed until September so that students can complete the program. A wine and cheese social is held to recognize those who have been participating in the courses.

July 31 - August 1, 1992 - Wendy presents a paper about the Heritage Language Instructor Training program at a national conference on Chinese education. Much interest is expressed and people seem impressed that a college would care enough to support community-based schools.

August, 1992 - Janet and Wendy spend much of the month trying to locate Joan to determine whether she will be available to instruct the fall courses as she had indicated in the spring.

September 4, 1992 - Janet and Jill are in a state of panic because Joan has told them that she may not be able to teach the class that starts on September 10 because she is too busy.

September 7, 1992 - Janet phones Wendy to say that the course must be offered and she volunteers to teach and to help in any other possible way.

September 9, 1992 - Wendy finally speaks with Joan who agrees to teach the first class of the course. Although she is very busy, Joan does not want to disappoint the students, LINGA or the college in terms of not fulfilling her commitment.

There is still no word about who will be the new provincial government consultant to work with LINGA. They have yet to hear a response from TINGA, regarding the implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training courses in the southern part of the province. Plans for the graduation of the first cohort of students are presented and some minor changes made.

September 10, 1992 - Joan is exhausted and very distraught; she is finally saying that she cannot do it all, yet admits to having problems letting go of these responsibilities. Janet, Joan, and Wendy divide the responsibilities for teaching the courses for the fall term.

Graduation Day

September 25, 1992 - Over 200 people attend the graduation ceremonies this evening. Jill has made silk flower corsages for the graduates and the instructors, a symbol of the importance of graduation day for her and her peers. All present are dressed in their finest.

The valedictory address is given by the quietest member of the graduating class. Everyone is surprised by the eloquence of his speech and his expression of emotion. Two rows of chairs in the auditorium are occupied by his family members and friends.

Among the community members, one of the proudest attendees is the principal of the heritage language school where five of the graduates are teaching. Two veteran heritage language instructors who were involved in the inaugural meeting to discuss the development of a program for heritage language instructors shed tears of joy as the graduates receive their certificates. The members of the program advisory committee are shaking hands with each other in recognition of the achievement of their goal.

The Future Looks

November 7, 1992 - Wendy attends a joint meeting of the executive of LINGA and TINGA to discuss provincial matters concerning heritage language education. She provides an update on the graduates of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Pam, the provincial government consultant, is present and indicates that political backing for multiculturalism still exists despite the statement made by the Minister of the department. The department has been renamed from culture to community development. The emphasis is now on citizenship and heritage issues. The executive of TINGA express continued interest in brokering the Heritage Language Instructor Training program in their region of the province.

November 12, 1992 - Today, the chairman of the provincial multiculturalism commission issues a news release which refutes the statement made by the Minister of this government department that the multiculturalism committee should be abolished. He states:

> We've come so far in the past three years in demonstrating to the public how cultural diversity benefits our province. To stop what we are doing now would have a very negative impact, not only for a large group of citizens but for the dozens of companies and institutions who we are currently working with.

January 16, 1993 - Wendy attends another joint meeting of the executive of LINGA and TINGA to discuss provincial matters concerning heritage language education. TINGA has continued to pursue discussions in their locale concerning a host for the program and has changed their mind from the university to a college (because of Tina's behavior).

March 26, 1993 - Janet and Wendy meet with Pam to discuss the proposal for funding the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Pam requests that the curriculum syllabus and a companion "train the trainers" manual be made available for distribution across Canada. Pam expresses concern that the market for local course delivery will not continue to exist. She thinks the courses should be offered on a cost-recovery basis. Pam adds that she will no longer provide monies to Joe's office in support of this project.

March 31, 1993 - Janet and Wendy scramble to prepare two final reports and a proposal for submission to the federal government office in Ottawa. They have less than 36 hours to prepare this proposal.

June 5, 1993 - Janet meets with Wendy this evening to discuss a letter which Tim has presented to Pam, the provincial government consultant. In this letter, he advises Pam that Community College has proceeded to offer the courses in the program a second time without the approval of the program advisory committee. Tim states that this second offering of the courses should not have occurred without first evaluating the courses. He adds that he is still awaiting an evaluation report for the project. Tim also indicates that he did not support the development of a program to prepare local heritage language instructors to deliver the courses to their peers. In his note, he praises Joan and is very critical of the level of support provided by the staff of Community College. Janet informs Wendy that this letter was not reviewed with her or other LINGA executive before it was presented to Pam.

June 6, 1993 - Wendy telephones Pam to discuss the contents of Tim's letter. Pam states that she is not giving it consideration since she knows that the statements contained in it are not valid.

October 26, 1993 - The approval of the proposal which was submitted to the federal government in March is announced at the banquet of the National Heritage Language conference. This was the first that Janet or Wendy have heard of this. Both are in shock, but ecstatic that the program is receiving support from the national office instead of the regional one.

Achieving the Dream

December 9, 1993 - This evening, eight of the graduates of the program and three of the instructors meet to discuss the development of a curriculum to prepare the graduates to teach the courses in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program to others in the community. Wendy is pleased to learn that the graduates are still actively teaching in their community schools. Three of the graduates are pursuing post-secondary studies (one at the local university and two at Community College) and all have received recognition for the courses that they completed in the Instructor Training program. As the graduates identify what they must know before they can share their learning with others, Wendy realizes that the dream that was described in the boardroom of Community College more than six years ago has become a reality.

Chapter 4

PERSPECTIVES OF LEARNERS

> I have been teaching in my [heritage language] school for four or five years. I always dreamed to be a teacher since I was a little girl. I finished high school, I went to university, then I had to quit because my father got into political problems. So I went to the city and I started teaching in an elementary school and received some vocational training on weekends and in the summer. Little courses like I took here. I received a lot of experience in that way but I am not a qualified teacher back home. But sometimes I think the people that have the degree just went into education because it was the "easy way out". I forced myself to become better because I do not have a piece of paper to back me up. I have enjoyed working with kids all my life. (Eva 69-79)

Numerous themes emerged in the data obtained through interviews with the thirteen graduates of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, herein referred to as the learners.

Background of Learners

Forty-two heritage language instructors comprised the first cohort of students to enrol in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Of this group, 14 successfully completed the program and 13 of these learners were interviewed. This group included 12 women and one man. A variety of heritage languages were represented including Spanish (four learners), Italian (two learners), Gujarati (two learners), Portuguese (two learners), Tagalog (one learner), Tigrina (one learner), and Hindi (one learner). Ten of the learners had completed the equivalent of a bachelor's degree and two had completed the equivalent of a master's degree. Six of the learners had been formally prepared as teachers in their country of origin and had taught at the elementary or secondary school level. All had been involved in teaching their heritage language in Canada, from 2 to 10 years, with two of the learners being the founders of their particular heritage language school. All 13 learners were teaching children in their heritage language schools with two also teaching adults.

Learners who completed one or more of the courses in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program completed written evaluation forms for each course which they completed. These evaluation documents were reviewed by the researcher to compare perspectives with those of the graduates.

Definition of Heritage Language Education

Only one learner chose the federal government definition of heritage language as "ancestral languages which do not have status as official languages" (Jim 10-11). The rest of the learners provided definitions which emphasized cultural retention and incorporated learning the structure of the language, as well as the teaching of values, customs, traditions, and history.

Some contended that the teaching of heritage languages should occur exclusively for the benefit of a particular ethnocultural community. As one learner commented, heritage language education is "...teaching your culture, teaching the children the values in your own culture, and also hoping that when they grow up that they will not be an enemy to your culture but accept it as part of life" (Sara 63-65).

Other learners recognized the value of heritage languages being taught to those who are not part of a particular ethnocultural community. In the words of one heritage language instructor,

> ...heritage language education means teaching my mother tongue...to not only people who belong to my own region but people of all kinds - to Canadian people or to any person who wants to learn my heritage language. To teach a heritage language doesn't mean just to teach the language but to teach the way that I am, the way that my people are. I see the importance of not only grammar but also culture. (Maria 7,9-12)

Use of Other Terms

Only one learner expressed a strong desire to maintain the term "heritage language education" and not to use the term "second language" instruction.

> No! The term second language to me sounds like French and German which is formally taught in the schools. Heritage is something that you have inherited since birth. So for instance I would say that our language should be put in the same category as Native languages... I think it should be identified as a heritage language. (Sara 71-75)

Several learners indicated that the terms "heritage language" and "multiculturalism" had started to receive negative attention and that to continue to use the term heritage language education could adversely affect the future of the community-operated schools. As one heritage language instructor stated, "I don't like being classified under this term. These days even the term multiculturalism causes irritation for some people. I would rather see the term language used instead of heritage language" (Faye 47-49).

Yet another learner viewed this situation from a personal perspective and commented, "I think that it's bad. I always feel that by using the heritage label I become a second-class citizen. Especially based upon the words of the provincial Minister of Culture" (Lilly 17-19). As a third learner added, " ...I don't like being marked by my language. So people may want to change the term so that they will not be labelled badly" (Faye 8-10).

Heritage Language Education and Multiculturalism

There was a diversity of opinion among the learners concerning the consequences of defining heritage language education as an aspect of multiculturalism. Only two learners were supportive of incorporating heritage language education with multicultural education. They viewed this partnership as a way of providing an opportunity for politicians to recognize the status of heritage language education. As one heritage language instructor suggested, "It is important that we give a place to heritage language education in our society. The politicians should give full consideration to the development of heritage language education" (Jim 14-17).

Eleven of the learners expressed an unwillingness to have heritage language education affiliated with multicultural policies and programs. These individuals stated concern about the lack of public support for multiculturalism and perceptions that multicultural activities infringed upon the rights of others. As one commented, "I think that because right now we are experiencing such a backlash it should be put to the public not as a right of everybody but as a way to educate our children in a world that has become so small" (Lilly 6-9).

Importance of Context

The learners interviewed became involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program in 1990, when classes were first offered. Thus, they only provided comment concerning situations which may have influenced the implementation phase of the project.

Factors Influencing Program Implementation

The learners were aware of the challenges encountered in securing funds during the implementation phase of the program since it affected the scheduling of the courses in which they were enrolled. They concluded that the economic, political, and social contexts affected program implementation.

Economic Context

The most significant event which the learners identified as affecting heritage language education was the cessation of federal funds to the community-operated schools. As one learner explained, anyone affiliated with these heritage language schools noted the impact of this decision.

> In 1990, when the government cut the grants to schools it affected our school. If you go to our classrooms now, the teachers will say to you all the time that, because of a lack of funds, we are suffering. (Faye 46-49)

This loss of financial support for community-operated heritage language schools placed considerable pressure upon students, parents, and members of the communities to generate funds from other sources. One learner noted that this pressure was greatest for families with several children attending heritage language classes:

> We had to rely on donations and for the first time we had to start charging fees. Before it was about $25 fee for the whole year, it was a small administration fee. Now, it's $10 per month per child for 10 months. That requires a year's commitment and to some people that is a lot of money. If you have more children it is $5 per child after several children. The funding cut really affected our school. (Sara 121-126)

This removal of financial support for heritage language education was viewed as a statement of the low value which politicians assigned to multicultural programs, specifically heritage language education. As one learner commented:

> The thing that has affected heritage languages the most is that these are hard economic times and there is competition for money. When people start to say "we have to restrain and spend less money", the first thing that they don't consider important is multiculturalism... The government showed this by cutting off financial support to the heritage language schools. (Cathy 28-32, 39-40)

Several learners considered the decision by the federal government to continue to provide support for the education of heritage language instructors as ironic. They explained that if school operating funds were reduced, then funds available to support the professional development of the instructors would also be adversely affected.

Political Context

Politicians' adoption of the term "multiculturalism" was viewed as a mechanism of control which provided the opportunity to selectively support ethnocultural communities, when appropriate. The learners considered the political context as not supportive of heritage language education and proposed that this situation had an adverse effect on heritage language programs, including the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. As one learner argued:

> I think that the government point of view on multiculturalism has divided us. I think that the mistake was to give such activities a name. By giving this concept a name it was used by the politicians for their own political purpose. Thus, they could then offer us money for our specific ethnocultural group... It was a mistake to label us, we should have been considered as Canadians with different backgrounds. After a while we recognized that as Italian Canadians we didn't need a political party to speak for us nor did we need Anglo-Saxons to present our concerns. We exist and so by dispensing with multiculturalism we cannot cease to exist as Canadians, as people. (Lilly 27-40)

Further concern was expressed that, during the past three years, government officials were becoming very public in stating their lack of support for programs for immigrants and their preference for English-speaking new Canadians. In the words of one learner:

> The Premier was the first one who was unsupportive and then the Minister of Culture and now the current Minister of Culture. The priority has been to accept immigrants who speak English... You

> don't have to put a mark on people, we are human beings and we need to respect each other for what we are. (Faye 35-37, 42-45)

Considerable uncertainty was noted regarding the likelihood of continued financial support for multicultural programs by both the federal and provincial governments. One learner spoke of the preoccupation of members of ethnocultural communities with this topic, as follows:

> ...when we as a community talk about what is happening in Canada and in this province, we find it a discouraging situation. We fear that government, with declining budgets, may decide to stop funding multicultural programs. It has been said by some politicians that would be wise, and that does not make us feel secure. For those teaching the language and those who are learning the language it is hard work and these comments are discouraging. (Faye 26-31)

Social Context

The support of the general public for multicultural programs was questioned by the learners. It was suggested that language education was not a priority. A perception that most Canadians would prefer a unilingual society was expressed.

> Since they don't consider multiculturalism important, heritage language education is not considered important either. Mainly because Canada has two official languages, English and French, every other language becomes less important. Everybody seems to want Canada to have just one official language and stop the teaching of French. Since the value of French is being questioned, the value of other languages is lowered. (Cathy 32-39)

The learners contended that public awareness of racism and discrimination was increasing. They concluded that this situation further diminished support for programs such as heritage language education which appeared to promote cultural retention. As one learner commented:

> The other problem is lack of knowledge which causes discrimination and racism. The first thing that people do is discriminate against the cultural expression of people. People think if you live in Canada you have to adapt your way of life to Canadian culture and forget your customs. (Cathy 141-145)

Stakeholders in Heritage Language Instructor Training Program

During discussions with the learners it became apparent that the concept of stakeholder was one which they appreciated fully. They explained that life as a member of an ethnocultural community had taught them much about vested interests and competition for resources.

The learners did not identify stakeholders in relation to the development and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Rather, their comments pertained to the one stakeholder that they perceived would most significantly influence their future as heritage language instructors, that being the provincial department of education.

Department of Education

The heritage language instructors were supportive of the provincial department of education being actively involved with the provision of heritage language education in the publicly funded school system. They considered the community-operated language schools as a good starting point for language education which could then lead to more formal studies. As two learners proposed:

> I think it is a great idea if heritage language education is continuous ... I believe that teaching heritage languages in the community is very important because communities are made of groups of people who are tied together by cultural bonds. (Cathy 53, 62-65)

> I think that it is good to have so many places involved in the teaching. Because if the kids get interested when they are very young they can see how one day they can continue their language studies in high school or at university. It would be good if more languages could be offered for credit. (Eileen 39-43)

Although there was much support for heritage language education being offered within the school system, all of the learners expressed concern that moving these classes out of the community, and under the jurisdiction of the department of education, would adversely affect their future as heritage language instructors. All agreed upon the value of native speakers of the language teaching the language, however, they did not think that the department of education officials shared this perspective. As one learner explained:

> A person whose first language is English if they go somewhere else and learn the language, you cannot learn it as well as if it was your mother tongue. First language is very important. I am not saying that someone who studies another language as a second language cannot learn it, I just feel strongly that these jobs should be given to native speakers who were former teachers. (Eva 56-62)

The learners were certain that the heritage language teaching positions within the school system would be given to teachers who held provincial certification. Based upon their experiences, the learners held reservations about the abilities of such teachers, as two of them readily articulated:

> I think that [my colleague] and I are in some ways better prepared than those who have taken four years of Education at the university. When we talk to some of the B.Ed. graduates at our school we find that they do not know how to develop materials whereas we can do it. (Lilly 98-103)
>
> I think if it is a heritage language then it should be someone of that heritage teaching the language. I'm not saying that person should not have a teaching degree; it is a great asset if they have one. Drawing upon the person's experience and knowledge culturally you will gain a lot more than from a language teacher who is merely teaching the language. (Sara 129-134)

All of the learners agreed that the ideal teacher of a heritage language would be someone who was a native speaker of the language, had been raised within the particular ethnocultural community, and was formally educated as a language teacher. In the words of one learner:

> If the person really knows the culture, or has been brought up in that country, then it's okay. Actually I think that the person who is teaching should also have a degree, a teaching degree in teaching language. (Debra 135-138)

The learners hoped that the completion of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program would be recognized by the government department responsible for teacher certification and would provide more opportunity for them to teach within the school system. They also realized that essential to the achievement of this goal was the maintenance of the policy which allowed non-certificated teaching personnel to work under the supervision of a certificated teacher.

Outcomes of the Program

Overall, the learners were very satisfied with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. They were somewhat hesitant to provide comments concerning areas for improvement. However, when encouraged to do so in order that future students could benefit, they did agree to the request.

Successful Aspects

The learners identified the following eight successful aspects of the program: opportunities to apply their learning, improved communication skills, a culturally diverse learner cohort, increased knowledge of the Canadian education system, peer support, increased levels of self-confidence, opportunities to share their learning with members of their communities, and quality instruction.

Application of Learning

All the learners indicated that they had become aware of new concepts and instructional strategies as a result of completing the program. Skill in materials development was a need identified by heritage language instructors throughout the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. It was one of the areas where the learners unanimously identified significant change in their practice.

> By taking this course I was able to formulate my materials and I could give them something that I got from the course and...they say that are enjoying it. I've done a lot of things, if I'm not sure what I'm doing the next Sunday I just go back to my notes from the courses. (Jill 225-231)

The recognition of the value of teaching language in context and instructional strategies that support this approach was consistently noted by all the learners as another area of change for them in their classroom practice. As one learner explained, this new approach to instruction resulted in more efficient use of instructional time:

> What I do differently is so many things, especially teaching conversation... I learned more about teaching language in context and developing activities and games. By using pictures and illustrations, now I can teach in a few minutes things what used to take me two or three weeks to explain. I have four boxes of materials. (Cathy 162, 172-176)

The heritage language instructors indicated that they had learned new ways to address a common frustration in their teaching, dealing with difficult students. Although at the beginning of the program they had stated that they wanted to learn ways to discipline children, as graduates they were now viewing this as a question of motivating students. For one learner, this change in thinking was quite dramatic:

> [The response of my students to these new materials and ideas] has been very positive. In my country, the way of controlling kids was very strict, like punishment. Here the idea is to work on the positive and to motivate the students. (Jim 110-112)

The concept that learning could be fun was now in evidence in the heritage language classrooms of graduates of the program. As two learners commented:

> I think the children now are learning through the fun part of the class as well. By taking these courses we learned how to use materials which helped teach the language but the children didn't know that they were learning a language. (Debra 288-291)
>
> Even the parents didn't realize the children were learning at the same time they were having fun. The parents were getting the exams back and saying "my child did that" and we answered "yes, your child did that." Then the parents started coming back and asking how they could help. (Sara 292-296)

The learners very much appreciated that "the examples that were given in the assignments were real cases. People were speaking from their own experiences so the value was great" (Cathy 227-229). In circumstances where classes were scheduled for one evening a week, the students appreciated having "...a full week to understand what you had learned and to try it out" (Eva 127-128). In the words of one learner, "When the instructor taught us something I brought it into my class the next time I taught. That was so great about this course, you could put theory into practise" (Lilly 138-140).

Communication Skills

The learners indicated that completing the courses in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program had improved their communication skills. As one learner explained, "I did learn more English. And I do talk more...I'm less afraid to speak now" (Eileen 111-112) and another commented, "I speak more...I socialize more with a different group of people" (Faye 180-184).

Cultural Diversity

The first cohort of learners was an ethnically and culturally diverse group. This provided an opportunity to learn about other cultures, an opportunity which all learners viewed as positive. This learning about other cultures was an experiential not an academic activity, as one learner recalled:

> I would say that the difference is that I have grown in the sense that I have gotten to know people more than by just exchanging words. I know them as persons - how they think, how they feel...That's the real thing that I gained, that I have become a better person by attending these courses. (Cathy 160-162, 164-166).

The learners found the cultural diversity of their student cohort to be an enriching experience. They were surprised by the extent of their shared concerns about various aspects of teaching and the administration of their schools.

> When you put together a group of people who have different languages and cultures but who all have the same interest, you are willing to share opinions. So you listen to things that can be done, experiences that others have, what has worked, what has failed. (Cathy 207-211)

Knowledge of Canadian Education System

Those who had children enrolled in the public school system expressed an increased awareness of the learning styles of their own children. In the words of one learner, "It has made us think about what kind of learners our own kids are" (Sara 240-241). Another added, "I am also now better able to help my kids with their education. I now understand the methods that their teachers are using" (Faye 127-128).

Peer Support

Nine of the learners had other instructors from their community school as members of the cohort. This provided a unique opportunity for these individuals to work together and provide support to each other. As well, when personal motivation declined, this colleague provided encouragement. In the opinion of one learner:

> Yes, many times we would help each other with things which confused us. We also motivated each other to attend the classes and get our certificate. We also worked on assignments together...I have to thank [the other teacher from my school] for continuing to motivate me to take the classes. For me, once I had done the course on developing materials, I had learned what I wanted. (Lilly 85-87,162-164)

Self-Confidence

All the learners noted an improvement in their level of self-confidence. Some described this as a change in communicative behavior, "I have more self-confidence. If I don't understand something, now I ask" (Michele 113-114). Others expressed an increased sense of empowerment, "...with enrichment you feel more powerful. This is what happened to me, I feel much better about myself because I feel that I accomplished that, this is what is so great" (Maria

255-257).

For those heritage language instructors who were working in a community school where certificated teachers were also teaching classes, yet another sense of growing self-confidence was experienced.

> [My colleague] and I found that this [not having a teaching degree] was a difficulty when we were working with other teachers. Before, when I tried to express my opinion to other teachers, I worried that they would think that I did not know very much, but now I don't worry about that any more. (Lilly 80-83)

This increased level of confidence in one's abilities as a teacher also encouraged the learners to be more flexible in their approach to teaching. One learner described her growing ease with responding to the emergent needs of her students:

> I used to have a regular schedule of what areas I would be teaching in my classes. Now I tend to go more with what the kids want. I have different activities and if my kids don't like one, then I change. I "go with the flow" more. It's working. It's really rewarding when a kid who used to fight with you comes to the class willingly now. (Eva 137-141)

Sharing the Learning

All of the learners created opportunities to share what they were learning in the Heritage Language Instructor Training classes with other teachers in their community school, parents, and members of their ethnocultural communities. For some, this interaction evolved into structured workshops for other teachers.

> We were always in contact with the other teachers at our school

> and we did little workshops for them. The other teachers were really happy when we gave them the highlights of our classes here. We gave them a presentation which was really successful. (Eva 117-121)

One learner recognized the value of sharing this information with more than just the teachers in the heritage language school and commented:

> After I finished the course, and I talked with the teachers and we had one workshop on how to develop materials...to show the teachers, the parent group from the community, and the material development group what could be done...We hope that the workshop will show them that [our language] can be taught, that the kids are able to learn in both languages at the same time, and also the importance of learning the mother tongue. We are hoping to get them involved and to recognize the value of learning more than one language. We also hope that they will help the children with their homework, encourage them, and adopt a positive attitude. (Faye 67-68, 77-79, 83-88)

Quality of Instructors

The learners were unanimous in their praise of the instructors in the program. They considered the instructors to be essential to their understanding of the curriculum and completion of their studies. Several learners suggested that the ability and willingness of the instructors to treat each of them as an individual, was very important to their success.

> The classes - the instructors were great - they went out of their way, and to make us understand what was going on. If we missed a class you always found a way to catch us up, you would meet with us in the morning or the afternoon. That was important for us, you bent yourselves for us. (Faye 199-204)

> In other situations I am a timid person...But with Joan - I think that she was the right person to teach us because she was open to you. From the first day she said "come here, I will teach you." It was wonderful the mood she created and we learned from each other. (Eva 190, 193-195)

Aspects Requiring Improvement

Five areas of improvement were recommended by the learners. These areas were: the integration of more theory in the curriculum, the provision of a workbook for learners, lengthening the courses in the program, scheduling the courses closer together, and increasing the number of instructors teaching the courses in the program.

Integration of Theory

For several learners the challenge was not merely one of understanding the concept which was being presented but "understanding what was behind the concept or theory" (Donna 268). This understanding of how concepts and practice interrelated proved particularly stressful during the final course in the curriculum which addressed lesson planning, as one learner reflected:

> Putting it all together at the end was challenging. The unit planning exercise was tough. It was a great course. Lesson planning was helpful. I think we should change the course name and call it unit planning instead of lesson planning. To finally understand what was required was challenging. (Sara 252-256)

Learners commented that the intensive nature of the courses, their fluency in the English language, and their lack of pedagogical training made comprehension of theoretical constructs difficult. They added that practical application of the theory, in combination with repetition and review, resulted in their eventual understanding of theoretical material.

Learner Workbook

One of the learners took the time to organize the notes and materials provided for each of the 12 courses and prepared a set of three handbooks, totalling 500 pages in length. All of the learners suggested that providing the materials for the courses in a workbook format would have better facilitated the review of materials for use in subsequent courses.

Length of Courses

Some learners expressed a concern that the intensive nature of the courses, the longest course being 18 hours in length, resulted in insufficient time to fully comprehend and apply the material presented.

> I guess the courses were well described and well offered. It was the time that was frustrating. Sometimes it might have been good if we had a more structured type of course. I would probably give a little more time to some of the courses. If you can get to the end of the course and feel that you have been able to apply that material then it is good. Sometimes we needed more practise. (Cathy 190-195)
>
> The course on evaluation was really hard for me. I found that there was not enough time to do it - it was the last class. I found that there was too much that the teacher wanted to show us in the time that we had. (Eva 123-125)

Scheduling of Courses

Two suggestions were offered concerning the scheduling of courses. These were scheduling courses on weekdays only and developing a comprehensive schedule without periods of several months, where no classes were offered. Classes were offered during the weekend for the first cohort of students due to the limited availability of the lead instructor. As one learner reflected, "...taking courses on Saturdays and evenings was hard because I had to leave my children at home" (Eva 126-127).

Finding substitute teachers, so that the heritage language instructors could attend the courses, posed some challenges. As one learner recollected, "I remember in my school we had a problem when we had classes on Friday and Saturday. Because five teachers were taking the courses at one time, they could not find enough substitute teachers to replace us" (Maria 308-310).

Due to financial constraints, there was a period of nine months when courses were not offered. This extended the time for the first cohort of learners to complete the program from 18 months to 27 months, a situation which caused frustration for more than one learner.

> It was a little too long. Maybe next time you could do it in one year or a year and a half. There were some times when we were in limbo. We had a gap and if you could keep it flowing it would keep up the commitment. (Faye 207-210)

> Knowing the schedule for the classes sooner. Sometimes the information came too late for me. Sometimes weekends were difficult because I was working and because of my family. If it was a regularly scheduled evening class, one night a week that was the best for me. (Faye 163-166)

Variety in Instructors

The first cohort of learners had the same instructor for approximately 75 percent of the program. As the developer of the curriculum, this individual chose to teach so intensively in an effort to field test the materials. Several learners noted the stress that this individual was experiencing. As one recalled:

> I think Joan should have had some help at some points. Even though we loved her - there were some courses that I would not want anyone other than Joan to teach - but still there was a time when she was very tired. I think that this was probably not planned this way. (Lilly 182-185)

Future Directions for Program

Two areas for future activity in support of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were identified by the learners: the development of a strategy which would allow for accreditation of the program and the preparation of a plan to prepare community-based heritage language instructors to offer the courses to their peers.

Accreditation of Program

The courses in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were designed as non-credit and as such were not part of a recognized certificate or diploma program offered by Community College. Several learners expressed disappointment with this circumstance.

> I don't see any future for heritage language education. This program took two years and we did receive a certificate, but in a way it is one that I can only use at [my heritage language school]. If we could have more structure and testing, et cetera and use two

> or three courses towards university or somewhere, maybe in this way we could encourage even kids who come to the ...school to participate. Two years is a long time to come up with just a non-credit certificate - that is my main concern. (Lilly 149-155)
>
> It shouldn't make any difference but it does because you feel something complete will happen at the end. Myself, I feel satisfied but again, it's the feeling that you have something at the end. And it is also society that gives you the status. (Cathy 197-200)

One learner suggested that her classmates who were most disappointed with the non-credit status of the program were those who had been teachers in their native country. She commented, "Some of the teachers, not particularly me, were teachers in their own country and they would like to teach in regular schools or teach a language class for credit. I would like to see that happen for them" (Faye 177-179).

Preparation of Community-Based Instructors

Of all the stakeholders, the learners expressed the greatest interest in the preparation of local heritage language instructors to offer the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Of the 13 learners interviewed, 10 stated a willingness to complete further courses to prepare them to do this. They indicated that they would feel most comfortable teaching the elective courses and assisting with the instruction of certain portions of the core courses.

Working Collaboratively

In the opinion of the learners, those involved with the planning and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were 'one big family'. The learners readily provided a perspective on situations that they felt demonstrated how people worked together to make the Heritage Language Instructor Training program as successful as it was.

Factors Which Facilitate Collaboration

In total, the analysis of the learners' comments identified seven factors which they thought contributed to a positive collaborative working relationship. They did not identify any factors which were detrimental to working collaboratively since, from their perspective, all the stakeholders involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program worked well together.

Process Factors

The two process factors which the learners' data revealed were acknowledgement and allowing for flexibility.

Acknowledgement. The learners stated that it was important to be recognized as making a contribution. They commented that in their interaction with the instructors and college administrators they felt that their experience, knowledge, and opinions were recognized and valued. For one learner, the receipt of a letter from a college staff member, in which she was addressed as a heritage language instructor, provided a sense of acknowledgement for her work in the community.

> It increases my pride to be called a heritage language instructor, it feels great. It's uplifting especially when I got the letter in the mail. I opened the letter and said "Great, I'm a heritage language instructor" and proceeded to dance around my kitchen floor. (Jill 245-247)

Also, for this learner, the acknowledgement of her contributions during class encouraged her to question her teaching practice:

> Even when my answer to a question was not correct, the instructor commended my efforts. She would acknowledge my experience in the classroom and encourage me to explore new ways of solving old problems. I was never silenced or made to feel embarrassed for my comments. (Jill 252-257)

Allowing for flexibility. The learners recognized that on several occasions, adjustments to plans had to be made by the instructors and college administration to meet the needs of the stakeholders. They viewed this willingness to be flexible as important.

> The willingness of sharing, the willingness of experimenting, the willingness of looking at ways of improving, the willingness of the instructors to make changes that would be more suitable for the students, the willingness to listen. (Cathy 203-206)

Relationship Factors

In terms of relationships between the stakeholders involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the learners stressed the value of caring for each other, celebrating events, maintaining a level of enthusiasm, equality in relationships, and personal connections.

Caring. The learners appreciated the interest that was shown in their learning and their lives. As one heritage language instructor commented, "You all took interest in us...You knew a lot about us...It was kind of a family" (Debra 335-337, 343). Another learner explained, "We were people, we were not just a number in the college system" (Sara 336).

Instructors and college administrators were quick to contact learners who did not attend classes. One learner recalled that this 'personal touch' resulted in her returning to class, "That's the main reason...I almost gave up my idea of doing all the courses. Then I met you and you encouraged me to do your last course" (Debra 276-278).

Celebration. At the end of each course, the learners and instructors would share a pot-luck luncheon. This celebration soon became a tradition, which as one learner suggested served a special purpose, "Remember we said that when we finished the course we would bring something - by doing that we are communicating and sharing the different customs and traditions of food and all sorts of things" (Jill 116-118).

Enthusiasm. Enthusiasm on the part of all involved with the program was identified as important. Some attributed the success of the program to "...the enthusiasm of the instructors and the people behind the project" (Debra 326-327), while others stressed the value of "...the enthusiasm of the students. If the enthusiasm wasn't there then the courses would have drudged on but they would not have been as enjoyable" (Sara 328-330).

Equality. The learners expressed a sense of comfort with each other, with their instructors, and with the college administrative staff. Over time, the learners suggested, these relationships between the stakeholders developed a sense of equality, particularly within the classroom.

> The group was exciting. The mood in the classroom was wonderful - teacher and students were working as one. Even though we came from different backgrounds, it was kind of a social thing. Nobody had to push me to come to class or to finish the program. I enjoyed it. I think we learned a lot. Nobody felt that they were much better than someone else. We were all equals. (Eva 182-187)

Personal connections. The relationships that developed between the learners, the instructors, and the college administrators helped motivate the learners when challenges were encountered. As one learner concluded:

> The good thing was that we became a group. We knew each other and we also shared each other's experiences, happiness and sadness. We were open to each other, and Community College and all the instructors and what was done by LINGA it was always a friendly atmosphere. I never thought that I was going to a class and would be pressured to learn. Because you are interested you come there and have a wonderful time and you still learn a lot. (Faye 155-160)

Summary

The learners preferred to define heritage language education in terms of language acquisition and cultural retention. They expressed varying opinions with respect to whether other terms should be used to describe heritage language education and, whether is should be considered multicultural education. The learners identified the economic, political, and social environments as influencing the implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Only one stakeholder was mentioned with relation to the program, that being the provincial department of education.

According to the learners, successful aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program included opportunities to apply their learning, improved communication skills, a culturally diverse learner cohort, increased knowledge of the Canadian education system, peer support, increased levels of self-confidence, opportunities to share their learning with members of their communities, and quality instruction. Five suggested areas for improvement were the integration of more theory in the curriculum, the provision of a workbook for learners, lengthening the courses in the program, scheduling the courses closer together, and increasing the number of instructors teaching the courses in the program. Two areas for future activity in support of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were identified by the learners; the accreditation of the program and the preparation of a plan to prepare community-based heritage language instructors to offer the courses to their peers.

The learners failed to identify any factors which they thought impeded working collaboratively. Rather, the factors which they considered to support collaboration included: acknowledgement and allowing for flexibility (process factors) and; caring, celebration, enthusiasm, equality, and personal connections (relationship factors).

Chapter 5

PERSPECTIVES OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPER AND INSTRUCTORS

> For me, as soon as I entered the classroom my energy and enthusiasm returned. As learners, these heritage language instructors were constantly demanding more information. Sometimes I was concerned that my explanations were unclear, that the students were confused, and that they would not be able to apply the concepts to their own situation. When they presented their assignments in class the next week, I was astounded by their creativity, and their application and synthesis of the material. If only all my students could be as passionate about learning.
> (Wendy May 1992)

A variety of themes emerged in the data obtained through interviews with the five instructors (Bob, Kate, Janet, Joan and Wendy). With the exception of Kate, these individuals were also members of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program advisory committee and were asked a series of questions which pertained to their role as instructors and as members of the program advisory committee. Their comments are presented primarily in this chapter with the occasional quotation being included in Chapter 6. Wendy was also an administrator for the program and comments arising from her instructional experience are presented in this chapter; the administrative perspective is presented in Chapter 8.

The comments of the curriculum developer, Joan, form the major perspective for this chapter. As the individual who developed the curriculum and taught the majority of the courses, she perhaps offers the most comprehensive point of view on these matters.

Background of Instructors

The members of the advisory committee for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program determined that those teaching the courses, in addition to possessing expertise in the particular content area, should have experience in teacher education and heritage language education. This recommendation influenced the selection of instructors to teach the courses.

Joan has more than 20 years of experience teaching official and heritage languages to children and adults. She has worked as a consultant to second language teachers and has been actively involved in teacher education for several years. She holds a B.A., B.Ed., M. Ed. and Ph.D., and has published a number of materials, curriculum guides and scholarly papers. Joan was the curriculum developer and also the lead instructor for the program.

Janet has been teaching at the elementary school level for 10 years. She is the founder of her community's heritage language school and has been actively involved with the school for ten years. Janet holds a B.A., B.Ed, and M.Ed. Together with Joan, she taught the majority of the courses in the program.

Bob is also the founder of the heritage language school in his ethnocultural community and has served as a teacher and/or administrator in this school for 26 years. He taught a vocational program at a technical institute in the province for several years.

Kate was an instructor in a career program at a community college for three years and worked as a curriculum developer at this same institution for five years. Her education includes a college diploma and a M. Ed.

Wendy has conducted workshops for adult educators teaching in educational institutions, the community, and the private sector for over 10 years. She has designed and offered workshops for adult learners for whom English is their second language for more than 12 years. Wendy holds a B.A. Sc., M. Ed. and is currently completing a Ph.D.

Definition of Heritage Language Education

Four of the five instructors were familiar with the federal government definition of heritage language and accepted this as an appropriate description. The three instructors who had been actively involved in heritage language education for several years preferred to define heritage language education within a broader context. In the Joan's words:

> To me then, heritage language is a Canadian term which refers to non-official languages (French or English) and non-aboriginal languages so therefore it could be any other language. Heritage language education I think should look at many dimensions of anything relating to heritage languages - so that could be the political dimension, sociological, pedagogical certainly, linguistic, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and so on. (Joan 18-26)

Use of Other Terms

The instructors clearly distinguished heritage language education from second language and foreign language education. They agreed that the continued use of the term heritage language education may limit the willingness of the government to support an activity which appeared to contribute to ethnocentricity. Thus, in their opinion, the resultant challenge was to demonstrate how heritage language education was supportive of Canadian society economically, politically, and socially.

Heritage Language Education and Multiculturalism

All of the instructors considered heritage language education to be an integral component of multiculturalism, however, they expressed concern that it had diminished in priority in policy documents. As Joan commented:

> It's almost ironic that in the B & B Commission that is clearly underlined but in the multicultural documents, initially as the multiculturalism policies were being formulated, you did see culture and language side by side. I think what has happened in the field of multiculturalism is a move towards anti-racism as opposed to a broader sense of culture. So heritage language education should be a part of multiculturalism and even I think as multiculturalism has evolved. (Joan 31-39)

Importance of Context

Three of the instructors (Bob, Janet and Wendy) were involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program since the inaugural meeting between Community College staff and LINGA members in 1987. Joan, became involved with the initiative during the latter stages of program development, as the curriculum developer and lead instructor. Kate, who taught only one course within the program, provided no comment concerning context and its influence upon program development and implementation.

Factors Influencing Program Development

The instructors stated that the efforts of Community College, LINGA, and the recommendations of research conducted concerning heritage language education influenced the decision to develop the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. As Joan suggested:

> I think that it's probably a strong grass-roots movement. Certainly Janet and LINGA - that was significant. I think that it was also significant that Joe happened to be in the position he was in [at the college]... over the past ten or fifteen years there has been a number of heritage language conferences or seminars and I think that all of those helped to add momentum ... I think some of the work at [an eastern university] was significant. (Joan 49-60)

Factors Influencing Program Implementation

The instructors were aware of the difficulties encountered in securing funds during the implementation phase of the program. They concluded that the economic context, research activities, and the social context affected program implementation.

Economic Context

The economic downturn was identified as the most significant influence on the implementation of the program. The instructors thought that the commitment of the college administration, the LINGA executive, and the government consultants to the implementation of the program positively affected the amount of funds directed towards the project. They also recognized that concerned individuals had continued to promote this project during times when government resources were declining.

Research

A factor that the instructors thought to be supportive of the implementation of the program was published research which promoted the value of teacher education for heritage language instructors. As Joan explained:

> The fact that although the federal government cut the funds provided to support the operation of heritage language schools in the community, and they were still willing to support initiatives which supported teacher education. Publications produced by both levels of government continued to identify the need for teacher education while academics were still promoting the value of children maintaining their heritage language while learning English. (Joan September, 1992)

Social Context

All of the instructors agreed that the general public began to increasingly vocalize concerns about the negative effect of immigrants upon the provincial economy during the time that the program was being implemented. Joan suggested that increased attention received by Aboriginal peoples may have further diminished society's interest and support of heritage language programs:

> I think that the rise of the aboriginal voice has been really important partially perhaps in quietening, in its own way, the heritage language voice...With the rise of Natives, which is positive for them, it separates and isolates again and that isolation can be politically disadvantageous as well as advantageous. (Joan 83-85, 94-96)

The instructors concluded that this declining public support for ethnocultural communities and activities which supported cultural retention placed government officials and politicians under increasing pressure to provide financial support to initiatives which reduced the adverse effects of cultural diversity upon 'mainstream' communities.

Stakeholders in Heritage Language Instructor Training Program

The instructors agreed, without exception, that the inclusion of stakeholders in all aspects of program design and implementation was vital to the success of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. The instructors offered comment about five stakeholder groups in relation to the Heritage Language Instructor Training Program: the members of the program advisory committee, the college, the department of education, the learners, and LINGA.

Advisory Committee

Those instructors who were actively involved as members of the program advisory committee for the most part viewed this group as a well-functioning one which supported the program. Discussions among the advisory committee members were often animated and at times lacked focus, as Joan recollected:

> But on a positive note, I think that it really reflected the wholeness of the group. We tend to really dissect, dichotomize, pigeon-hole and assign specific hats. The beauty of some of the conversation, albeit off the topic, was people brought all those hats to bear so we probably got a clearer picture of what was happening. (Joan 172-177)

Role Confusion

Although supportive of the role of the advisory committee, Joan experienced confusion concerning her role as a member of this committee and questioned the value of her participation.

> I have never been entirely certain for what reason I was a member. I felt that were certain people who were members because they represented bodies or expertise or whatever. Had I not been perhaps the curriculum developer or the lead teacher maybe I would not have been a member and so that made me feel a different kind of membership in the group - I wasn't representing anybody, I was informing - so that was strange. I always felt my membership was strange - a few times I wasn't even sure I was supposed to be there. It seemed as though I was supposed to be reporting about something at one meeting but then maybe I didn't need to be there the next time because there was nothing to report. There was a great deal of ambiguity. (Joan 135-147)

This confusion of role resulted in uncertainty in reference to who was accountable for actions arising out of the meeting. In her words, "Thus, it was difficult to discern who was speaking when and when something was decided upon, whose responsibility it was to carry it through - an individual's, an instructor's, an organization's, et cetera" (Joan 177-180).

Limitations Faced

The instructors perceived that the members of the program advisory committee sometimes hesitated to actively contribute to the discussion or to take action. For Bob this level of inactivity proved frustrating:

> When I talk about advisory boards, for me, it means everybody must say their opinion in any given moment without fear of being offended or making a fool of her/himself. If I had to go to an advisory board meeting and just listen then they don't need me. Actually, I would like to see a little bit more intervention. (Bob 228-236)

The instructors agreed that this apparent limited participation in program advisory committee duties was more reflective of limits imposed by one's professional role than one's level of personal commitment.

Maintaining Morale

At least one instructor considered the program advisory committee as a mechanism to maintain the morale of those involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program when times were challenging.

> I think that with this particular group and program the regularity and frequency of the advisory committee meetings was important because it was a morale question. These people are giving so much of their time that the least we can give them back is morale. They needed that. (Joan 417-421)

Community College

The instructors viewed the involvement of the college as being essential to the success of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. They recognized the work that was done by college staff in terms of advertising the courses, registering the students, recruiting and remunerating the instructors, scheduling the classes, arranging for equipment and materials, and providing certificates for the students. They also recognized the support which was provided in the word processing and editing of the curriculum syllabus for the program.

As a stakeholder group, the instructors agreed that the college assumed ultimate responsibility for the outcomes of the project. As one instructor explained, the college provided a sense of support for all those involved with the program and reinforced the importance of the activity:

> But with the institution (Community College) we are so grateful at being able to get their full cooperation, and people that are so involved in the making of the heritage language training program. You know what heritage language is all about and it made it easier to convince the key people [the funders] of how important the program is. (Janet 479-483)

Another instructor described the challenge faced by the college administrators in providing support to such a program without becoming too controlling.

> I think that professionals have to be involved without owning it. The professional background has to be tapped at a variety of levels - pedagogically, specifically in the second language domain and then in terms of teaching adults, the level of facility, some checking not just on the quality of instruction but that assignments are given, that people are treated fairly, attendance policies, et cetera. (Joan 421-430)

LINGA

The instructors thought that LINGA benefited substantially through its involvement with this project. New members joined the organization in order to enrol in the courses and later became more actively involved with the organization. Numerous presentations were made across Canada about the program and recognition was given to the role of LINGA in initiating the idea and providing support to the program throughout all stages of development and implementation.

Outcomes of the Program

The instructors identified a number of positive aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. They also offered suggestions for changes which they thought would improve subsequent offerings of the curriculum.

Successful Aspects

Overall, the instructors considered the Heritage Language Instructor Training program to be very successful. This success was attributed to the efforts of the learners and the willingness of the various stakeholder groups to work toward the achievement of a common goal. The instructors identified seven successful aspects of the program; opportunities for application of learning, a culturally diverse learner cohort, the DACUM process, empowerment of the learners, peer support, increases in the levels of self-confidence and self-esteem of the learners, and opportunities for learners to share their knowledge with others.

Application of Learning

The instructors witnessed a growth in understanding and application of the concepts by the learners. This was evidenced by their participation in class, the continuous improvement in the quality of their course assignments, and through the comments the learners made about the changes they were implementing in their own classrooms. As one instructor commented:

> It used to be a very regimented approach, a grammar school focus -now I don't think that is what is happening. As I have talked with many of the teachers they have said "Oh, I have been using what the instructors have been teaching us." They also say that "teaching in our programs is really more enjoyable and

> pleasurable" and I think that they are thinking about making coming to school more pleasurable for the students too. (Janet 158-164)

Several of the instructors had the opportunity to observe the learners as participants at a national conference for second language teachers. The learners commented that they understood the information which was presented, were familiar with the terminology, and felt comfortable interacting with other participants.

There was also some evidence that the learners were beginning to develop critical thinking skills. The instructors expressed disappointment due to the intensive nature of the curriculum sufficient time to more fully develop these skills was not available.

> I think other growth... So the kind of reflection and critical questioning that I hoped we might have reached we didn't reach, that I know implicitly is there if we continued we could pull out. Of that I am confident. I say that because when I go through my review I always review theoretical principles and they got them down pat. (Joan 330 338-343)

Cultural Diversity

The cultural diversity of the learners was considered by all of the instructors to be a strength of the program and something which should be maintained in subsequent cohorts. Given the composition of the student cohort, opportunities to learn more about various cultures were readily presented. Through these interactions the instructors observed a developing sense of respect for diversity.

> A greater openness to communicate across cultures and while certainly the structure of the courses and the activities allowed and imposed that, there was a sense intuitively of growing respect - a respect that came perhaps from thinking that the answers lay either within oneself or one's own community towards one's language issues to recognizing that these things can be shared and it's worth listening to one another. (Joan 310-318)

DACUM Process

All of the instructors in the program were familiar with the DACUM process. Two of them had facilitated the workshop which resulted in the competency profile and four of the instructors were involved in the process of determining how these competencies were "blueprinted" into the curriculum. Their comments concerning the value of the DACUM process in developing the curriculum syllabus for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were very positive. As one instructor stated, "...the DACUM system... is a very democratic approach which allows the input of people who are there. So that is one factor which was a very positive one to start with" (Bob 56-60). The curriculum developer, Joan, echoed this sentiment, "First of all I think the DACUM was excellent. I think that was good way to start" (Joan 414-415).

Empowerment

Several of the instructors suggested that the learners experienced an increased sense of personal empowerment as a consequence of completing the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. The instructors defined empowerment in reference to skill development and recognition, by the learners, of the value of the role of heritage language instructors teaching in the community schools to the education system.

> The overall goal was to improve the methodology of all teachers because that was the thing we thought we needed to become more successful in our heritage language programs. At least not just being viewed as "fillers in" of what was lacking in the school system. (Janet 35-38)

Peer Support

Although it took some time to emerge, the instructors all agreed that a sense of camaraderie did develop among the students. As one instructor commented, "I was pleased to see the camaraderie of the group...no cliques were evident" (Kate 60, 69). This development of a group identity supported peer instruction and peer learning. Kate considered this to be an indicator of quality learning, "Peer instruction and peer learning was very important. The adult education literature states that what a learner shares with others is the best evidence of the learner's ability" (Kate 22-24).

Peer support was most evident when more than one instructor from a particular language school was enrolled in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. This situation provided numerous opportunities for the learners to work together. As Joan observed:

> I think also that for the language groups where there was more than one teacher there was more growth... This is one of the reasons I think that principals should become more involved because if they can encourage two teachers to take it, then it will be better -the participants will grow more and I think the benefits to the school will be greater. (Joan 319-327)

Self-Confidence and Self-Esteem

Perhaps the single greatest achievement of the learners, in the opinion of the instructors, was their increased level of self-confidence and self-esteem. As one instructor commented, "The idea of taking a certificated program through a community college is an enormous step. It means they must have a great degree of self confidence and many of them began without that, but that has grown over time" (Joan 408-411).

Coupled with this growing sense of self-esteem, many of the learners developed a comfort with expressing their views in more public forums. This was not merely a reflection of improved literacy skills but rather a developing sense of consciousness about the issues which were important to them. As Joan suggested, "The consciousness that is being developed among the students as well and that means not just their self esteem but their willingness to speak out on their behalf in various places" (Joan 590-593).

Another significant change in the learners, in the opinion of those teaching in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, was a growing recognition of their proficiencies as teachers.

> So I think it is important to let them know how successful the program was - confidence was built and the graduates have a special way of recognizing the importance of their role in their heritage language school. They can now say "we know better how

> to approach the teaching of heritage language to our children" and it's not just saying "we have learned traditional ways which we learned in the home country, we are using methods currently used in Canadian schools employing new technology, new ideas." (Janet 146-153)

Bob described this improvement in self-esteem as a catalyst for the development of a sense of superiority among other heritage language instructors.

> From the little contact I had, I thought everyone was very enthusiastic, the enthusiasm which comes from engagement and involvement. When I met the students they were about 50 percent through the program and I found that they were excited and I detected in them a feeling of almost superiority in that the others would not take this course and they were proud that they had. (Bob 410-416)

Sharing Learning

The learners proudly informed their instructors of the opportunities they had created to share their learning with other heritage language instructors. The learners were all quite active in their own communities, sharing what they had gained by offering workshops for other teachers in their community in their language.

Aspects Requiring Improvement

Eight areas for improvement were identified by the instructors. These included the manner in which the curriculum was delivered, the amount of feedback received from the learners, the development of a workbook for the learners, the integration of more theory in the curriculum, changes to the order in which the courses were offered, recognition of the limited resources of the heritage language schools, changes to the way in which the courses were scheduled, and increased variety in instructors.

Delivery of Curriculum

The format in which the curriculum was offered changed in response to the needs of the instructors and the learners. The initial plan was to deliver the courses in a protracted format, with classes being held one evening per week. In the words of the curriculum developer and lead instructor:

> When we first started, the intention was probably delivery that meant we would meet once a week with an assignment in between. When I developed the course syllabus I developed assignments for each week but as we moved into things, I suppose by listening to these people who had full time jobs and still taught Saturday school - somehow it didn't feel right anymore. What did feel right was to prepare something in the heritage language which could be considered a learning resource. To do anything else in terms of an assignment, given 40 weeks of classes, that would have meant 40 assignments. So there was a change in terms of delivery. (Joan 269-280)

Due to the limited availability of Joan, courses were offered on Friday evenings and during the weekend. This change allowed for the development of a more intensive workshop format, which in her opinion was a positive alteration.

> When I started off with the first course, the first time my goal was to move into a workshop approach but I recall us having discussions about making sure this was kept at a serious level and a slight apprehension that if we moved to a workshop format it might be reduced to colouring and pasting and the substance may have been lost. But that I quickly confirmed would not happen. So when we re-offered course one we went right into workshop mode and sort of maintained that throughout. (Joan 261-269)

Feedback from Learners

Those instructors who were teaching courses of six or nine hours in length expressed frustration with the limited time available to gather comments from the learners concerning the direction of the curriculum. They further indicated that this situation limited their ability to be responsive to the needs of the learners. As two instructors explained:

> My concern was that there was time for the theory but how could I get feedback when there was only one session between classes. If I had three sessions of two hours each then I could have had more feedback from the students. (Bob 510-514)
>
> I faced the same thing because I didn't know who was going to register for my course until that evening. I had sent all prospective students a letter asking them what they wanted to learn and didn't hear anything back. So on that first night I had a plan but I negotiated with the students to determine what they wanted to learn. I had one more class than you did to try to reorganize based upon their needs. (Wendy 623-633)

Even Joan who had the most extensive amount of time with the learners identified the need to incorporate more opportunities to hear the thoughts of the learners concerning the curriculum.

Integration of Theory

Initially, all of the instructors stated that they were hesitant to provide theoretical materials to the students because of their fluency in the English language. Upon reflection, all instructors indicated that in teaching their course a second time, they would incorporate more theory into the curriculum.

> The expectations we had at the very beginning; we thought we should not expect too much of our teachers but as we went along, we learned that they were high calibre teachers. So we made changes saying they can do it so why do we have to lower our expectations of what they can do. So now with the second group, I think what I will do now that we have finished the first and second courses and see that there are many out of the fourteen who can do the work well, I think I will leave my expectations as high as for the first group of teachers. (Janet 182-189)

Learner Workbook

The instructors provided numerous notes and articles to the learners. The benefit of collecting these resources in the form of a workbook was identified by all of the instructors, as Janet explained:

> The practical aspect had always been considered the highlight of every course. But there will be quite a few things we can do - say for instance now, more materials can be given to them which are not just an outline but provide a compilation, a compendium of all the things we have been teaching. Instead of just touching on the materials we should provide a summarization of what we have taught at the end. (Janet 191-196)

Recognition of Limited Resources

The instructors found that considerable variance existed in the resources available to the heritage language instructors teaching in the community operated schools. Variances existed in the amount and quality of resource materials available for students, audiovisual equipment, and the quality of instructional facilities. As one instructor commented:

> The application of their learning to their own setting was dependent on resources available although they genuinely tried to learn about equipment they did not have access to. They had an unlimited

> supply of ideas but faced limitations in terms of resources available and funds to produce resources. (Kate 70-74)

Scheduling of Courses

In the opinion of the instructors, a commitment of two years to complete the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was a very significant action on the part of the learners. The instructors recommended that these courses should be scheduled in such as way as to decrease the time between courses, thus allowing learners to complete the program in less than two years.

Several instructors contended that the time between courses caused some learners to question why they were participating in the program and resulted in the decision by some, to end their studies.

> That was the very thing lacking amongst all of them when we started. We knew that we were going to face that and I think that's why we had a big drop-out in the number of teachers participating in the program; it was because they did not really know where they were going. They knew it was a pilot program and they weren't too sure what was going to happen to them. The confidence was not there for them to continue and for these teachers who dropped out of the program, now that I see them at university and we talk about things they say "yes, I wish I could have gone on." (Janet 138-146)

Sequencing of Courses

The instructors suggested minor revisions to the order of topics within particular courses as well as the sequencing of the courses. Four of the graduates of the program completed some courses without having completed the pre-requisite courses. This raised questions concerning the sequencing of the courses, as Joan remarked:

> ... other changes would be the ordering of the weeks within a course and also the ordering of the courses. I think the up-front courses are pretty secure but I think the latter ones... I still wonder. I believe we offered 10 and 11 in reverse order and I'm not sure that was the wrong thing to do. There might be some advantages of having some overlap there, the last two weeks of one, the other one starts. I'm not sure, I would have to think about that. (Joan 286-293)

Variety in Instructors

Although five instructors were involved in the delivery of the program, two instructors taught the majority of the courses. These two individuals identified this situation as being stressful and recommended that in the future there be a more balanced allocation of teaching responsibilities. As one explained:

> Thankfully, they were a really strong group... We were all running out of steam. You had a different priority, the last year. I was beginning to feel the stress of all the commuting. We weren't as well organized (thank goodness we had a syllabus) as we might have been. People were getting tired...All of these things began to play. (Joan 332-338)

Future Directions for Program

Two areas for future activity in support of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were identified by the instructors. First, the development of a strategy to allow for accreditation of the program. Second, the development of a plan to prepare heritage language instructors to offer the curriculum in their local areas.

Accreditation of Program

The instructors held a variety of opinions concerning the value of the Heritage Language Instructor Training courses being offered as a credit program. They indicated that this change would not dramatically affect their approach to instruction nor their sense of personal accomplishment. One instructor suggested that the learners may have changed their perceptions of the importance that the accreditation of the program held for them.

> At the beginning, they were a little leery that it was a non-credit course and they said "then it will really take us nowhere." But as the courses went on they realized that it's not a matter of credit or non-credit but the idea of what value they are able to get from the courses. And that to me that is very important because even now that we have our first graduates, they are saying "I want to continue to go to school - I don't want to stop now." So here we have graduates who want to come back to [the same] class in so much as they are wasting their time. That to me is a big step knowing that they don't care whether it is credit or non-credit. I shouldn't say that they don't care because they would like to see some day or in the near future some of these courses to be converted to credit - maybe in their advanced program that would be possible in that as much as now they have proven themselves successful maybe we could look at this training as an accredited program. We should be able to start to work on this. (Janet 102-116)

The instructors recognized the need for a clear agreement of the meaning of the term "accredited" and the potential benefit of these courses becoming recognized as such. The instructors held different understandings of this term:

> When we talk of accrediting, it does not mean that we will convert all the courses but, just that we would as in the case of professionals who have been accredited in foreign countries, some credit would be given for previous learning...If they continued their

> studies at Community College then one or two credits could be given for completing the Heritage Language Instructor Training courses or perhaps exclusion from the requirement to take one or two elective courses. (Janet 127-135)

> I would like to say that in our case, my guess about the accreditation is probably a need for a legitimization. In our case, the fact that they get a certificate and a letter at the end of each course and eventually a graduation. Just to see the rise in self-esteem of these people is wonderful. (Joan 543-547)

The instructors supported efforts to have these courses recognized for advanced standing towards further post-secondary studies rather than as a certificate program. Several of the instructors commented that the teacher accreditation body should recognize the value of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program in preparing heritage language instructors.

Preparation of Community-Based Instructors

The instructors unanimously agreed from the inception of the program that the ultimate goal would be to develop a training program which could be taught by local heritage language instructors. They anticipated their involvement would diminish as the graduates of the program assumed responsibility for teaching the curriculum. As one instructor commented, "Now that they have completed the two year course they should be able to take some advanced level courses and become lead teachers" (Janet 116-118). The instructors recognized that not all of the 14 graduates of the program may be interested in assuming this role however, they did expect that several would be so inclined.

> If, or when, we offer the 12 courses again, I would hope that we can involve some of the graduates as instructors as well. If not as instructors of whole sessions, certainly of select components. I think that allows the instructors of the heritage language program to develop their own professional expertise as well as sharing that with their communities. (Janet 239-243)

In retrospect, Joan stated a desire to commence the process of developing the skills of these future instructors at an earlier stage.

> At times I wondered if we shouldn't have had some instructors that taught when I could observe so that I could have sensed what kind of sense they were making of what I wrote in the syllabus. But in reality that would not have been possible. I know what happened was the best that could have been under all of the circumstances and constraints. It would have been nice to have been able to have foreseen that approach and built it in. (Joan 474-481)

The instructors also expressed an interest in having a variety of learning opportunities available for those involved with heritage language education, including administrators.

Working Collaboratively

The instructors identified two stakeholder groups with whom they worked collaboratively, the students and each other.

Factors Which Facilitate Collaboration

The analysis of the instructor data presented six factors which facilitated collaboration.

Relationship Factors

The instructors suggested three relationship factors which positively influenced working together. These factors were: demonstrating one's human qualities, celebration of achievements, and personal connections.

Being human. Over the course of the two years, the students became very familiar with each other's behaviors and the behaviors of their instructors. Due to the intensive nature of the program, and the small cohort of learners, the instructors felt that showing one's 'human side' was conducive to collaboration.

> Typically I am very quiet about challenges I may be facing in my personal life. In working with this group it was important to be honest about my own limitations. As instructors, we really needed to be able to express when we were overwhelmed and needed assistance. The learners became very good at recognizing our human failings. It's important that teachers can make mistakes too. The students feel more comfortable seeing our human side. (Wendy, March 17,1990)

Joan was working in a city 380 kilometres away and commuting on the weekends to teach the classes. In addition to the stress of working in two centres, while maintaining a family life, a variety of personal challenges confronted her. Typically one who maintained her own counsel, she contended that "with these learners, honesty was the best policy" (Joan, June 3, 1992).

Celebration. The instructors were surprised by the initiative of the learners in organizing a pot-luck luncheon to recognize the completion of each course in the program. As two instructors reflected:

> The tradition of sharing a pot-luck meal at the end of each course developed at the end of the first course. I thought that the interest in this activity would decline, but it never did. It was a way of sharing part of one's culture and acknowledging the completion of yet another course. (Wendy, October 4, 1992)

> The hospitality was marvellous and surprising, they told me that pot-luck dinners at the end of the course was a group tradition. I had to re-organize my activities for the last evening of class to accommodate

> the festivities. I have never experienced such a welcoming climate among a group of learners. (Kate 61-62)

Personal connections. The two instructors who spent the most time with the learners both mentioned the friendships that developed between the learners and themselves. These instructors continue to see the graduates of the program as well as others who participated in the courses. They described a sense of ease in chatting with the learners about their work as heritage language instructors and their personal lives. As one instructor described this personal connection, "...the support and friendship that was developed. I think that I will really have to say I will preserve that for the rest of my life" (Janet 18-20).

Structural Factors

In terms of structure, the instructor data evidenced three factors considered supportive of working in collaboration. These factors were continuity of instructors, definition of ownership of the project, and the existence of a supportive infrastructure.

Continuity of instructors. During the second year the courses were offered, the lead instructor's available time was limited and it became necessary to employ additional instructors. For Janet, who became the second lead instructor, continuous involvement with the development and implementation of the program proved beneficial, as her comments suggest:

> First, when we are talking about curriculum, maybe the fact that I wanted to be involved with the curriculum development was a good move on my part. So it didn't really bother me - the shadowing from beginning to end - what I really tried to do was fill in the gaps. In the

> meantime, without the curriculum developer knowing it, I was adding my thoughts and viewpoints. (Janet 214-218)
>
> In as much as I did not really prepare the curriculum and was just under the direction of the curriculum developer, what I did was really tried to follow what she wanted me to do. I put my own personal perspective into the material. I wanted not to disrupt her program but yet I managed to find a way of presenting things which I thought was more effective... And in doing that I found that I was more successful in letting the students know that I am a different personality compared to the other instructors. I think they respected that. (Janet 43-50)
>
> If I did not really know what was happening and just went into the classroom, I don't think I would have been as successful. It would have been very interesting on my part to see if without that knowledge I would have substantially changed the curriculum without the author knowing it - and perhaps jeopardized our success. (Janet 228-232)

Definition of ownership. The question of ownership of the Heritage Language Instructor Training curriculum proved most perplexing for the curriculum developer. Joan stated that "there is very much a sense of ownership of the courses among the students" (Joan 253-254) yet struggled with her own need to feel a sense of ownership for the work she had done.

> Most of the things I've been involved in - I initiated and then conceptualized and then saw through. So this was one where I had a say in the conceptualization but I didn't initiate so maybe this is why I feel this sense of ambiguity, not just on the advisory committee. I'm not sure what was originally desired - what were the motives, besides just to get a heritage language instructor program and I don't know what they were...So as much as I'm happy that all the things that were planned, and hoped for, and intended to be came about, I still don't have a sense of closure. (Joan 581-592)
>
> But the issue still is it is not my program. I never felt that, in fact I was embarrassed at how the courses seemed to be recognized as mine...It's their program - and all I did was delivered things that they

> wanted to know that hopefully intrigued them and interested them. It never was mine - the syllabus design was mine. ..even if my name is on it as teacher or writer, it still isn't mine in the same way that something that I begin as a concept. Maybe it's Janet's or some smaller inner circle of LINGA...(Joan 627-629, 634-637, 655-658)

Supportive infrastructure. All of the instructors stressed the importance of the development of an infrastructure which clearly defined the responsibilities of the various partners involved with the program. Joan offered comment as follows:

> Sometimes you get a call from a community organization and there is lots of talk but no action - with no kind of motor such as the college and LINGA or support such as the grants. It was not so much the money but there was an infrastructure to make it possible. (Joan 204-208)

Factors Detrimental to Collaboration

The instructors considered the Heritage Language Instructor Training program to be an example of effective collaboration between stakeholders in the design and implementation of an educational activity. Only two factors which created stress among the stakeholders were identified.

Process Factors

The two process factors which were suggested as impeding collaboration were evolving workloads among the instructors, and a lack of clarity concerning ownership of the curriculum.

Evolving workloads. The curriculum developer who was contracted to develop the syllabus for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program also assumed a major portion of the instructional responsibilities, by choice. In her words:

> To be perfectly honest, it flowed out of developing it and the development I didn't think had reached a point where others might understand it. In other words, I acted somehow as a temporary intermediary where the instructional role was to ultimately given to someone else. (Joan 183-187)
>
> When we originally developed the curriculum I had not intended necessarily to teach as many courses as I did, but because the courses are short in nature, and sometimes we have tried to offer them in various patterns, such as one evening a week, such as a Friday night, Saturday morning, Saturday afternoon or such as two evenings a week. I stayed involved and we have experimented to see how quickly we can get through the material and also what is convenient to the students. (Joan 321-328)

In retrospect, Joan cautioned against creating a situation where a program is so dependent upon a single human resource.

> In that respect, I realized at one point when I had a car accident, and was out of commission for a while, how dependent the program had become on me and I don't think that is a healthy situation at all. (Joan 286-289)

Unclear ownership. Given the high level of involvement of the curriculum developer in the design and delivery of the courses in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the other instructors assumed that this individual would feel a sense of ownership of the curriculum. It was quite surprising to one of these instructors, when the contrary was discovered, as a conversation with yet another instructor revealed:

> She said that she wasn't sure sometimes why she was doing it because she hadn't been involved in the project since the first stage. This really shocked me. Her previous experience has been where she has created the idea and done everything from step one, so she doesn't feel that it's her curriculum. You first stated that it was her curriculum and that you were working within that. The government is unclear on whose curriculum it is, and the way it is written in the contract it isn't the college's. So it is really a different experience for me in terms of who feels that they own this curriculum. But I think that what you're saying is encouraging because you are saying that you were involved from the beginning and you did feel a part of it. (Wendy 236-246)

Summary

The instructors provided the broadest definition of heritage language education of any stakeholder group. They recommended the use of other terms which were not so ethnocentric in their orientation, yet considered such language learning to be multicultural education. The instructors attributed the development of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program to the efforts of Community College and LINGA staff. They suggested that the economic and social contexts influenced program implementation. Research concerning the value of heritage language education was also offered as a factor which encouraged the government to provide financial resources to the program.

Three stakeholder groups were mentioned; members of the program advisory committee, Community College staff, and LINGA executive members. The instructors concluded that the college assumed ultimate responsibility and risk for the program. Varying opinions were offered with respect to the effectiveness of the program advisory committee, with some discussion of the role confusion experienced by its members.

According to the instructors, successful aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program included opportunities for learners to apply their learning, a culturally diverse learner cohort, the DACUM process, empowerment of the learners, peer support, increased levels of self-confidence and self-esteem of the learners, and opportunities for learners to share their new knowledge with members of their communities. Eight suggested areas for improvement were the adoption of a more compressed curriculum format; increased incorporation of learner feedback; integration of more theory in the curriculum; the provision of a workbook for learners; recognition of the limited resources of the community-operated heritage language schools; scheduling the courses closer together; varying the sequencing of the courses; and, increasing the number of instructors teaching the courses in the program. Two areas for future activity in support of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were identified by the instructors; the accreditation of the program and the preparation of a plan to prepare community-based heritage language instructors to offer the courses to their peers.

The instructors told of collaborative relationships with the students and their peers. The factors which they considered to support collaboration included: demonstrating one's human qualities, celebration of success, and personal relationships (relationship factors); continuity in instructional staff, a clear definition of ownership of the project, and an infrastructure which supports the development and implementation of a program (structural factors). Factors which the instructors suggested were detrimental to effective collaboration included workloads which continuously evolve and a lack of clarity with respect to ownership of the program (process factors).

Chapter 6

PERSPECTIVES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

> I thought it was good committee because everyone who was there had a legitimate interest in heritage language education. This was dear to their hearts. Whether they were from government or the community or an institution, you knew that these people were committed. You knew that they would go to any degree to get things done. This kind of project had not happened before so it was new for a lot of us. I don't think anyone had any personal agendas, it was more of a group project, a common cause. I think that people worked really hard to accomplish this goal. (Karen 103-112)

Sixteen of the twenty members of the program advisory committee were interviewed. Four members who had retired from the committee were not available for comment.

Background of Advisory Committee Members

The advisory committee for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was established in accordance with the policies of Community College. The terms of reference for the committee were ratified during the first meeting and are presented in Appendix E. Over the period of the case study, 20 people served as members of this committee. The two administrative staff from Community College (Amy, Wendy) who were directly involved with the program, as well as the six consultants (Ben, John, Karen, Ken, Pam, Sue) and the lead instructor (Joan), were non-voting members of the committee. The voting members of the committee included eight executive officers from LINGA (Bob, Cynthia, Don, Janet, Jill, Judy, Mary, Tim), an expert in second language education from the local university (Bill), a representative from the provincial department of education (Paul), and an administrator from the college (Joe).

In accordance with the terms of reference for the committee, meetings were to be held two or three times each year. Initially, the group met more frequently and served as a working committee. As the program was implemented, the frequency of these meetings diminished and the role of the committee more accurately reflected the terms of reference. A schedule of the meeting dates of the advisory committee is provided in Appendix H.

Definition of Heritage Language Education

All of the advisory committee members were familiar with the federal government definition of heritage language education. Yet, they preferred to describe heritage language education within different contexts, as two explained:

> Heritage language education would be any form of education for languages other than the two official languages of Canada...the term heritage language tends to reflect the greater emphasis placed on cultural background than quite often is in the school-based study of the two official languages. (Paul 6-7, 16-18)

> ...languages spoken in Canada which are not recognized as official by the federal government...generally heritage language education means the language is used in the social realm, for example in families, or for cultural purposes, as distinct from working languages, of say the economy or the state. (Joe 6-11)

Several advisory committee members expressed concern that the term heritage language education held multiple meanings for stakeholder groups. In the opinion of one advisory committee member, this resulted in a clouded perspective of the parties involved in heritage language education:

> My particular biased opinion is this, we don't have an accepted definition for heritage language, therefore, it sounds like many organizations are involved. I personally don't feel comfortable that they are coordinated or agree on what they are doing anyway. So I think that...we should try to lobby again to get some consensus between levels of government departments and school boards to agree on something we can all accept as "heritage language". (Tim 151-159)

Use of Other Terms

All members of the advisory committee noted that a plethora of terms to describe language education had emerged within recent years thus creating considerable confusion. As one member commented:

> This business of modern language, second language, heritage language, makes it difficult to know where to draw the line. Besides, heritage language is not heritage. I think we have a little work, actually a lot of work, to do in redefining. If we can come to the use of just one term then I want to know what we mean by that - you can use the same word but mean two different things. (Bob 186-193)

One member of the advisory committee expressed concern that terms were being used for political not pragmatic purposes with particular reference to the adoption of the term "international languages". In his words, "We have added a second distinction now, using the term international languages, in trying to attach the term international to more economic and globalization concerns - an international stand in international economic development" (Paul 11-14).

Heritage Language Education and Multiculturalism

The advisory committee members confirmed that heritage language education should be included as an aspect of multicultural programs. As one individual explained, "It is definitely a component of multiculturalism whether at the provincial or national level" (Paul 24-25). Another member of the committee added, "I think it is fundamental. I believe without language there is no multicultural foundation whatever in Canada" (Tim 14-15).

Looking at the question of the relationship between heritage language education and multiculturalism from an historical perspective, the advisory committee members thought that the federal government had attempted to give recognition to this union. As one member commented:

> [During the period from 1968-1972), it was a very, very major political question...The only recognition for any other language [other than English and French] was with respect to Section 38 which said nothing in this [Official Languages] Act shall impinge on or contravene the historical rights of other languages...the silence of the act on other languages, that was a very significant political comment because it was made in response to many language groups trying to get public status. So the silence meant that these other languages were relegated to some unofficial status and that government itself would not credit it with any legal standing...In 1970, the government finally responded to Book 4 of the B & B Commission and there were in those recommendations, some recognition of other languages. The government set up its policy at that point...that is when funding began for these other languages. They were not defined to be working languages so the funding was set up in a very general way without any reference to pedagogical values, legal status, or economic impact. In other

> words, basically what was set up was a program to placate community groups with symbolic grant programs... a grant legitimates that school in some way, not pedagogically, legitimates it in a political sense. It is now some kind of activity that need not be seen as entirely private, it is now a public activity. (Joe 48-82)

Despite the evidence of government support for heritage language education, all of the advisory committee members questioned the impact of these efforts. As one member lamented:

> There is a lot of talk about implementing the multicultural or heritage language program by politicians all the way across the country. I often wonder sometimes in the dark moments if it isn't merely vote attracting because when it comes to actually producing the money and the support for it, with a very few exceptions, there doesn't seem to be a lot done about it. (Bill 23-27)

Another advisory committee member echoed this sentiment in describing the limited efforts of government, particularly those of the federal government:

> ...[the] federal government, never put substance, even within the limits of its own department and the small grants program it set up, even within that small confine, it never put substance into it. It could have easily hired a language expert even within the limits of the few dollars. The four million, whatever it was they gave out, they could have done significant work within that parameter and they have opted not to do it. (Joe 143-148)

Importance of Context

The members of the advisory committee had much to say concerning the role of context in both the development and implementation phases of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. All members were actively involved in the field of heritage language education during the time that the program was under development. Although some of these individuals were not directly involved in the development of this particular program, they did have a recollection of economic, political, and social concerns during that time period.

Factors Influencing Program Development

The general opinion of the advisory committee members was that the need for a program to prepare community-based heritage language instructors had existed since the inception of the community-operated schools. One advisory committee member recalled that the idea had been discussed for at least ten years prior to the inception of the program.

> Actually, it goes back even further than that because the provincial government and [the predecessor of LINGA] did a needs assessment study to find out if there was a need for a multicultural centre in [our city] and the topic of teacher education for heritage language people came up over and over and over again. This in fact was to be one of the things mentioned in that report. (Bill 59-63)

Community College

The one member of the program advisory committee who considered Community College to be the catalyst for the development of the program, expressed this opinion:

> I think we played some role in creating it, we spent some time working with the group...I put the idea in their minds so to speak. You see part of this general neglect by the government of these groups meant that they had no sense of where they might move organizationally. I remember talking them into the idea of applying for core funding so they could have an office...they were so used to a grant of $500, so the idea that they actually have a staff person was just awesome... We did the writing for them and they put their name to it and went in and made their representations. (Joe 369-384)

LINGA

The other members of the advisory committee clearly stated that the idea of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was initiated in the community. They commented that teacher education was a goal identified by the organization since its incorporation. As one advisory committee member representing LINGA remarked:

> We had been talking about this since LINGA formed in 1978 -it's one goal being to help teachers who had been trained in other countries to be able to be at a level similar to the teachers being trained in Alberta...Once our community schools were more established, we decided it was time for the teachers to come in and really make the quality of education given by our community schools as high a standard as the rest of the educational system. (Janet 285-287, 291-294)

Other Programs

Several years before, a course for heritage language instructors had been offered by the local university. Although the course was only offered once, in the opinion of several advisory committee members, it set a precedent for courses in this area and was used by others as a model. As the committee member who taught this course explained:

> Many years before that I offered a course...for teachers in heritage language schools and it was not done without a fight, but was also done with a great deal of support by the university authorities, principally the registrar, whereby most of the requirements for admission to a university course were totally waived. The problem, and what I feel badly about, was that we did have a program all laid out and for reasons which totally escape me, the department which was to provide the next component in the course, elected to advertise it in the summer session calendar and wondered why nobody from the heritage language group applied to enrol in the

> course...As a result, the program totally floundered. However, the following year a professor from Saskatchewan came and we had a very lengthy talk about what it was we had tried to do and Saskatchewan, I believe, went on and established a fairly substantial program from that point. (Bill 39-54)

Political Context

All of the advisory committee members contended that the political environment influenced the availability of resources to develop the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. One member described this influence from a personnel perspective:

> ...there are a series of key people, in key places at moments along the way, who despite this general scene have put themselves in defense of the heritage language program and have managed to protect what has been achieved to date...you have a series of the nature of Ministers..[who] were open to its continuity. (Joe 321-331)

Another advisory committee member suggested that the announcement by the federal government of an institution to further practice and research in the area of heritage language education, positively affected resources allocated for related initiatives.

> The other factor is continued lobbying and the climate in 1987-88 where it may have been viewed that this would be a transitional program which would eventually be incorporated in the operation of the Canadian Heritage Language Institute but I would think basically the support recommended by the studies for heritage language training was probably the primary reason. (Paul 47-51)

Not to be forgotten, in the opinion of the advisory committee members, was the community pressure which was exerted to ensure that funds for heritage language projects were maintained. As one member commented, "There truly is a function for LINGA and TINGA in so far as they are there defending the program, it makes it harder for politicians to cut" (Joe 333-336).

Research

Research in the area of heritage language teacher education, conducted provincially and nationally, was also identified as a possible influence in the support of the development of this program. As three advisory committee members reflected:

> I think the studies that have been done over the last ten years in the province have indicated that teacher training and professional development are really important needs in improving heritage language programs. The role of teacher training, teacher education, and professional development was identified as an important role for the Heritage Language Institute which was proposed by the federal government. I think they have always recognized the importance of teacher education, so I think that probably is the primary factor that led to funding of the program. (Paul 39-46)

> ...some of the very, very early conferences where researchers, like myself, from across Canada were all pulled together, the topic that was probably highest on the priority list was that of some form of formal recognized teacher education for teachers in the heritage language group. So the concept of the LINGA/College program has a long, long pedigree. (Bill 65-70)

> ...I did provide a brief in 1988 in the provincial public hearings around the countryside, before they released their document. At that time I gave them four recommendations - one of them is provide teacher training in order that volunteers can do their job right. And that's the kind of influence from the community that may have something to do with the program eventually being granted. (Tim 24-31)

Factors Influencing Program Implementation

The advisory committee members identified several factors that, in their opinion, had influenced program implementation. As in the case of program development, they viewed the community college and the political environment as affecting the outcomes. In addition, they mentioned the economic environment, other programs, and the social milieu as influencing the program implementation process.

Community College

The fact that multicultural programs were a newly established priority for Community College was thought to have had a positive influence upon the level of resources that the organization made available to support the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. As a college staff member recalled:

> In 1986, the College did a task force survey on what role it might have in the field of multiculturalism. In 1987, we set up an Office of Multiculturalism. It is one of the factors that if we weren't doing this then perhaps we wouldn't have the occasion or time to spend with LINGA. Perhaps they wouldn't have had as close a relationship. (Joe 442-446)

Economic Context

In the opinion of the advisory committee members, there were several economic factors which influenced the implementation of the program. The withdrawal of federal government grants to support the operation of community-based heritage language schools diminished resources available for release time or tuition costs for heritage language teachers. As one advisory committee member commented:

> One thing was that our funding was cut in 1990. Quite a few schools...were not ready to be self-sufficient at that time and the number of students started to fall behind in as much as we could not offer the programs we thought we would. It took at least a year or two to really come up again by building our own fund-raising as a means of being able to meet our expenses... we had no resources to support teacher education. (Janet 320-326)

As the province entered a period of economic decline and became concerned with the provincial debt-load, support for programs which were of benefit to a particular community were at risk. As one committee member cautioned, "The economy, without a doubt, had an influence. When things have to be cut back then these so called frills go" (Joan 97-98).

Other Programs

Several advisory committee members viewed competition as an incentive for the provision of resources to support the program. In their opinion, activities in other locales encouraged the government to continue to financially support the program. As one member proposed:

> One of the factors is that there are similar projects in other jurisdictions and people really don't like getting left way, way behind. When Saskatchewan or British Columbia comes up with a project and they are seemingly moving ahead that impacts on people's thinking. It is hard to be a complete dinosaur so they try to stay up. (Joe 432-436)

Political Context

During the implementation phase of the program, the advisory committee members noticed a decline in the level of commitment by both the provincial and the federal government. They further commented that there appeared to be little discussion between the two levels of government concerning who was responsible for heritage language education. One committee member viewed this uncertainty in terms of the level of support for heritage language as an opportunity to garner resources.

> Ideologically they make so much noise about not getting involved in things it should be a voluntary thing. On the practical level, a vote-gaining level, maybe they saw that it was expedient to go along and give us the money. Mind you, they still have a policy and in spite of trying to get away from giving direct grants to schools, they still have a part to play to help seminars and teacher development. So politically, I think we are lucky to get the approval and the financial backing because both governments are in a see-saw situation right now. (Bob 76-84)

A similar opinion was offered by another individual who suggested that the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was supported simply because government had no alternative plans for the funds.

> The question is why did the government fund them, given the general attitude of neglect? Well, here you have the community taking initiative. I think that there is just such a vacuum of ideas over there that, in the absence of any alternative to knock it down, they had no way to put them off as far as I can see, and so they agreed to do it. But, they have done it as badly as possible. They didn't get contracts for two years, they demand to see this, they demand to see that, money is lost. You see what I mean. It clearly is something that was foisted on them that they would just as soon not have had to deal with. (Joe 385-393)

Another member added that the Heritage Language Instructor Training program also reflected the priorities defined by the federal government in terms of support for teacher training and thus appeared to be a politically correct activity to support.

> The involvement of LINGA in the program meant that there was a certain amount of sociological pressure which translated into political terms and more or less ensured the funding of this kind of program, especially since the government had funded other studies which made this same plea for teacher education over and over and over again. The government was in the very fortunate position, I felt, of being able to respond positively to a long term request. (Bill 99-105)

Social Context

The general impression provided by the advisory committee members was that society-at-large was showing diminished support for multicultural programs. As one member said, "There has been a questioning of multicultural policies across the country, as well as provincially. In the light of the Constitution, discussions in terms of how the linguistic and cultural minorities can be supported, some re-questioning" (Paul 62-65).

Growing concern was expressed about retrenchment to a "frontier mentality" that would exclude cultural diversity and adversely affect ethnocultural communities and programs designed in response to their needs. One advisory committee member indicated fear over this rising sense of adversity towards cultural diversity:

> ...[it] is a very difficult political environment because it is a frontier culture, and the notion of amalgamating differences supersedes a

> notion of plurality or diversity. Levelling, neighbors have to be neighbors and so on because we are in a survival mode out here and can't afford this and that. There is generally a public hostility to French as a national official language and of course if you don't accept something as major as that, then you certainly don't accept the notion that minority groups should get any kind of public support for their efforts, for their public programming. (Joe 259-266)

This antagonistic attitude towards the support of multicultural programs was reinforced, in the opinion of several advisory committee members, by the government's refusal to clarify how public dollars were being utilized to aid the general public, not specific ethnocultural communities. As one member argued:

> ...[the provincial government's] steadfast refusal to actually engage and to fully articulate a policy and define objectives, goals, means, standards of measurement, public control...There is no one out there defending the public dimension itself. Without the defense, the general public makes no distinction between public and private funding...What is really needed here is someone on the government side to respond and say "we don't give money to private endeavours. We give money to public endeavours which are of benefit to the whole population". (Joe 277-282)

Stakeholders in Heritage Language Instructor Training Program

The members of the program advisory committee agreed that the inclusion of stakeholders in all aspects of program design and implementation was vital to the success of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Six stakeholder groups were mentioned by the advisory committee members: members of the program advisory committee, staff of Community College, the provincial department of education, members of the various ethnocultural communities, LINGA, and the learners.

Advisory Committee

The program advisory committee that was established for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was structured in keeping with the guidelines developed by Community College for all such committees.

Value of Role

All of the advisory committee members considered the establishment of such a committee to be a benefit to the design and implementation of community-based programs. As one member suggested:

> Definitely the user group must be included in whatever designing because we cannot bureaucratically or academically design a program which is basically for the community level and practical use. Academically speaking, there has to be the expertise through the arrangement of the college to get those people to design it properly. Then the next thing is to call on some really experienced people sitting on an advisory committee to provide some comment, about the design. That would be the way I would prefer it. (Tim 137-145)

Role of Committee

One member, who had served on such committees for several years, defined the role of the program advisory committee very pragmatically:

> Well, I think primarily to support a community initiative in language education would be number one. Secondly, to help provide some advice that would be consistent with what language activities have been undertaken at the provincial level. (Paul 110-113)

Several members viewed their role as one of providing advice to the college on matters concerning the direction for the program. As two commented:

> The way I perceive my role on the committee is to provide advice. I mean when there is doubt from the college or even the stakeholders, coming up with some opinions. In fact, this advisory committee is supposed to sort it out, discuss it, come to some consensus and advise back to the parties involved, be it the instructors, the college or LINGA. (Tim 116-121)
>
> I expected all members to have an input, not only suggestions but also comments in evaluating what we were doing, if we were true to the mission statement and the general objectives. Now here the general objective is to improve the pedagogical ability of instructors so therefore I see myself as a resource person bringing some practical experience and giving some advice. (Bob 221-227)

Managing Conflict

Given the variety of interests represented by stakeholder groups, it was inevitable that some disagreement would occur throughout the course of such a project. Two members of the program advisory committee were most impressed with the way conflict was managed within this forum. As they explained:

> I think the committee worked extremely well together. I am not conscious of any problems. I have a suspicion that if there were any problems they took place outside the committee and got ironed out there. I think on one or two or occasions I did have a feeling that there had been some negotiation outside the committee, so that the committee in essence never really heard about it very much. (Bill 157-162)
>
> It seemed to function well. I think as well as any committee of that nature. I think the primary work was obviously done outside the committee. The materials development, curriculum development, the management and organization of it, it would be the project manager who primarily did a lot of that work. It was probably more of a sounding board, a focus. (Paul 115-120)

Government Consultants

The advisory committee members considered the government consultants to be significant stakeholders in reference to the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

Role of Consultants

The committee members tended to view the role of the government consultants as limited to that of providing and receiving information. As one remarked:

> The reason is that here we have government representatives sitting around therefore they were also updated of the problems financially of this project. This helped them to pass the information on back within their organization and not criticize too heavily either Community College or LINGA. (Tim 128-133)

Level of Commitment

All perceived that a variance existed in the level of commitment of the government representatives. As one member explained:

> I think there is a split among those people who are sympathetic and those who are trying to do as little as possible or nothing at all...at the more junior levels you will find more sympathetic people and as you go to more senior levels you will hear more about all the problems associated, which is to say that the more senior levels are more resistant to achieving something in the language area. (Joe 420-427)

One advisory committee member questioned whether the government consultants did in fact consider themselves to be stakeholders in the program. In the words of this individual, "The government, they committed at the beginning, in providing some support and I don't think (I may be completely wrong) they feel at this moment they are the stakeholders" (Tim 69-72).

Limits of Legislation

The members of the advisory committee recognized that substantial legislation existed which was, in principle, supportive of heritage education initiatives. As one member commented the existence of legislation does not guarantee the support of appropriate programs.

> It is nice having these things in legislation, better to have it than not, but legislation doesn't necessarily mean government programs in the area. You have to have not only legislation, you have to have regulation, you have to have budget, and you have to have staff, and you have to have policy. For something to work in government you have to have all four or five elements and senior management knows very well that you can set up a piece of legislation and not carry it out in policy or practice. (Joe 191-198)
>
> There is no strategic plan, there is no staff expertise, there is no training they initiate. There are no curriculum materials, what there is are community groups who muster an initiative and pursue their initiative doggedly until they run out of excuses and they provide another grant to allow the community to do that project. (Joe 245-248)

Changes in Consultants

There was unanimous agreement among the members of the committee that the continuous change in the consultants representing the provincial government resulted in a loss of continuity and adversely affected the accessing of funds to support the program. As one member remarked:

> In my personal opinion, I would think one of the reasons for the cooperation not being as good as it could be was the internal restructuring of the provincial government department. Given the

> continuous change of staff and their assignments and the role of the department. So because of these things the department, itself was in limbo in terms of who was taking over what. If we did not have this internal serious restructuring of the department I think the cooperation would have been much, much better. (Tim 275-283)

Department of Education

Generally, the members of the advisory committee thought that the provincial department of education had neither the inclination nor the resources to assume sole responsibility for the provision of heritage language education. They did, however, recommend that this department could provide leadership in terms of curriculum and policy development. One member offered the following suggestion:

> Given our economic climate now it will be most important that the community be the primary leader with any community agencies such as colleges that can get involved to reflect those kind of needs. The department of education has a role in terms of the language education policy which provides support to each of the heritage languages. We have a curriculum development role as well as a resource role so we can find a way of developing an implementation role as well at the school level. (Paul 127-135)

The members did not acknowledge that rumors continued to exist within the community that the department of education would displace the community-operated heritage language schools and assume responsibility for this language instruction. The committee members hoped that if this transition occurred that the stakeholder groups would be partners in this decision. As one member suggested:

> Our provincial government consultant is starting to tell us that maybe one of these years we will be engulfed by the department of education. I have no quarrel with that at all, except we should be able to maintain our own credibility, our own personal values as community schools - with the idea of being partners...They should be able to make use of our teachers because they have been trained as teachers and they should be able to make use of the curriculum that we have developed... so with partnership...I think it will work quite well. (Janet 394-403)

The advisory committee members expressed the hope that recognition as valuable resources would be given to those teachers who had completed the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

> We are not afraid any more - even if the department of education is going to take over heritage languages now, we are going to take the onus for teaching your children. We will not even be afraid because right away we will say we have trained teachers - you can make use of us - unlike before we were not ready to say how we would accept that challenge when it came. Now I feel that we are half-way able to consider that the battle is half-won and we may have the ability in the near future to have our very own teachers working in partnership with the department of education. (Janet 307-315)

LINGA

In the opinion of the members of the program advisory committee, LINGA was a key stakeholder in the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

Focus for Organization

The Heritage Language Instructor Training program provided a focus for the organization and the opportunity to grow through working collectively towards a common goal. As one member explained:

> Over the years LINGA has had many, many organizational problems, like any other volunteer groups. But I think that the only reason we can plan together is because we believe individually and collectively in heritage language education. (Tim 249-252)
>
> The consequence of this project had a most serious impact on LINGA. It forced everyone to be more practical and more serious about what they personally feel about heritage language education itself. Before the project, some of us may not consider a standard or expectation of what heritage language education can provide to the kids. And the third, I think that before the project, the members (some of us) may not even have thought there was a place for LINGA to get involved in instructor training. So I would say that LINGA grew up because of the project, in a very, very substantial way. (Tim 257-267)

Growth of Organization

The requirement that heritage language instructors participating in the courses be members of LINGA resulted in increased membership in the organization. As one advisory committee member observed, "With this project LINGA is able to get more membership. It encourages, a few years ago people did not know what LINGA was all about" (Jill 195-197).

Increased Profile

The involvement of LINGA with this project provided in the view of the advisory committee members an opportunity for a higher profile for the organization locally, provincially, and nationally. As two committee members reflected:

> ...like most things in life, a few very committed individuals do most of the work. One would say that they would not be doing it unless they were getting something out of it. It's not likely monetary but learning is something they're getting out of it. The consequences for LINGA, I think

> as an organization they are far more credible...hopefully that means if they go forward with something else, it's going to be looked at seriously...it looks like a lot more networking, grass-roots kind of stuff is occurring. (Joan 533-544)

> I think they will be highly respected across Canada for having been involved in a program like this. I think the fact that they have gone out and in company with the college worked on a program which prepared heritage language teachers, I think was extremely useful. I think the fact that there is formal preparation of heritage language teachers when previously there was none, down the road, will make life easier for heritage language teachers who apply for admission at the university. (Bill 382-388)

This higher profile will serve as a reminder to the members themselves, that they are capable of successfully undertaking such a project. The comment of one member represented the view of several others:

> I think definitely it demonstrates that they can exercise a level of leadership and professional development and succeed. So the consequences are, I think, it should give them greater self-esteem as well as more credibility as an organization that can carry out a valuable professional development service. (Paul 246-250)

Stress on Human Resources

Assuming responsibility for this program required a commitment of time and energy by several members of the executive of LINGA. As one advisory committee member who was also an executive member of LINGA stated:

> It was a very big challenge for LINGA and the onus was always left on us whether we were going to have money, developing the proposal, writing the evaluation report, the grant applications et cetera...But fortunately with the college and government... with the cooperation and collaboration they have provided all the way through, I think we managed to achieve our goal. The only thing is that you have to be prepared to learn to clearly know what you are asking for and to prove how important it is. (Janet 452-462)

Learners

Several advisory committee members thought that the learners were a significant stakeholder group. They recommended the inclusion of some learners as members of the committee. As one individual commented:

> I think that we should make use of our grads and appoint two or three to the group. And involve them in as much as these are the people who know the strengths and the weaknesses of the program and maybe they would be able to give us suggestions concerning how to improve the program. (Janet 384-387)

Outcomes of the Program

The advisory committee members spoke of the value of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program in terms of successful aspects of the project and areas for improvement should such an initiative be undertaken again.

Successful Aspects

Overall, the advisory committee members considered the program to be very successful. They attributed this success to the continued commitment of the various stakeholders to completing the project. Eight aspects of the program were noted as successful, including: achievement of partnerships among the stakeholders, application of learning, cultural diversity of learners cohort, the curriculum syllabus, improvement of teaching practice by the learners, opportunities for government departments to be involved with the program, increased self-worth of the learners, and opportunities for the learners to regain their status.

Achieving Partnership

The opportunity for the various stakeholders to become actively and meaningfully involved in all stages of the development and implementation of the program was acknowledged. As one advisory committee member remarked:

> The fact that we were able to develop a partnership among the institutions, the stakeholders, the funders, and the teachers especially...Starting the DACUM analysis for the development of the curriculum with Joan doing it and so many people like you, myself, and members of the advisory committee and the teachers themselves I think that's the biggest. And to have the teacher's involvement all the way through. (Janet 415-425)

Application of Learning

One of the advisory committee members, who had previously taught courses for heritage language instructors in the community, was pleased to discover that the learners were now thinking more critically about their teaching practice.

> If anything, I think the program has not told them that they don't know what they are doing but on the contrary has gone out of its way to make them feel like they have an awful lot that is very worthwhile, which needs to be looked at critically and in the light of some other things they have learned about. (Bill 279-283)

Based upon observation of and conversations with the learners, the advisory committee members all noted a marked increase in the level of skill development of the group. As one member commented:

> The other contribution is that the program has made them aware of different approaches to second language teaching or first language maintenance than they were maybe aware of and I think that is good. Probably the most important thing is that it has taught them something about planning. (Bill 275-278)

A second advisory committee member suggested that the learners' level of awareness of pedagogy had improved.

> I am sure there is a level of awareness that has been created for the teachers about the different aspects of heritage language education. There is probably some useful knowledge they have acquired; various techniques whether they be teaching techniques, application techniques, classroom management and so on. (Paul 185-189)

Cultural Diversity

The advisory committee members recognized that the cultural diversity of the learner cohort provided an unique opportunity to interact and learn from each other. As one member stated, "The sense of community, the sense of getting together and working together and the communication that has been created amongst the teachers, probably will be the most long lasting effect" (Paul 189-192).

Curriculum Syllabus

The curriculum syllabus for the program was in the opinion of the advisory committee members a comprehensive, clearly written document which could be used in other settings. As one member commented:

> I believe that we do have a very reasonable package of curriculum - thanks to Joan because she is a very unique case anywhere - because she came through heritage language classes as a child and ended up with a focus on heritage language in her professional life. That's why she cannot only try out the courses but come up with a very reasonable document. (Tim 189-195)

> I believe we are offering one model with practical experience which can be used as a reference or as a good example for anyone when

> they are thinking of doing something of that nature. I'm not saying that ours is the only one or the best one, we have a very good model. (Tim 196-200)

Encouraging Improvement of Practice

As the first cohort of learners completed the program, the advisory committee members noted that there was a growing interest among other heritage language instructors in the community in upgrading their skills. One member who was actively involved with various ethnocultural groups shared the following thoughts:

> I think it has set off a whole dynamic among the teachers who are watching but not in the program. From what I hear it is beginning to establish norms. All of a sudden it has kicked off of the beginnings of what eventually could become the pyramid of proficiency. Because people see each other, they watch, if there is a need to they want to compare, they don't want to fall behind. (Joe 771-776)

This individual further suggested that enrolments in future courses within the program would be influenced by the referrals of the learners and this emerging sense of peer pressure.

Opportunity for Government Involvement

Generally, the voting members of the advisory committee were quite critical of the level of support provided by government to the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. One member suggested that this project provided a much needed opportunity for two government departments to indicate support for heritage language education in a concrete manner.

> ...hopefully the government departments because they funded a successful program...gained credit for it and hopefully it will prod them to actually think how they might help in the next step. Maybe it will help them see what their leadership responsibility actually is... to actually act on it. (Joe 776-782)

Increased Sense of Self-Worth

All of the advisory committee members thought that the self-worth of the learners had improved from the time they entered the program. One member commented that this was not the case with other programs in educational institutions:

> The feeling of self-worth on the part of the students who are involved in it. I think for years, and I blame the university for this, we said to them that you are not able to carry out study here at the university in teacher education because you didn't have what it took, either language-wise or whatever...I think that is the one thing this program has done is it has taken good people and made them feel like they were worthwhile. (Bill 260-263, 272-274)

Another advisory committee member expressed the hope that the sense of self-worth which the learners had developed through participating in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program would serve to encourage them to further their studies.

> The fact that there is a program in a college, in a public institution, has been very successful in the sense first of all that it gives those community people a public setting for training. It gives them certain skills, it validates their aspirations, they want to carry on and do more, go higher, fly farther. It has strengthened their sense of self-worth. (Joe 760-764)

Regaining Status

All of the learners participating in the program had immigrated to Canada and many had not been able to resume the vocation they had been prepared for in their native country. The advisory committee members suggested that by completing the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the learners were able to regain a sense of status. As one member stated:

> ...there is this phenomenon of displaced status where in their home countries they may have had a professional standing which they don't have here. They are reclaiming at least within the realm of the community a certain role. (Joe 632-635)

Aspects Requiring Improvement

Four areas for improvement were identified by the members of the program advisory committee. These included: developing a more secure base of financial resources, increasing communication opportunities for the advisory committee members, increasing marketing of the program, and developing more efficient courses scheduling.

Financial Resources

The members of the advisory committee were acutely aware of the financial difficulties which were encountered throughout the course of the project. Although the chair of the committee and the college administrators attempted to exclude the financial affairs of the program from the advisory committee agenda, other members of the committee encouraged discussion of these matters. One member reflected upon the frustration created for all by the uncertainty surrounding the financial resources of the program.

> Now if we did have the option to start the whole thing again, I would like to see the government more definite in their commitment. Then we will know how much LINGA can offer by direct discussions with the college. It was basically LINGA and the college that tried to get this thing going. But because we don't have our own resources to get money - we don't have casinos, bingos, whatever - we have to basically count on 100 percent support of the government and we were told or by the policy (as it was) that both levels of government are committed to supporting this kind of project. That's why we committed ourselves into this contract with the college and I personally feel very bad when we cannot honor the timing of the grant to pass the money on to the college. I feel really bad. If we could do it again we would like to see the government committed complete with a document with a schedule where they would have to honor a schedule of payment or whatever support. This is something I would insist. (Tim 95-111)

Increased Communication

During the first year that the Heritage Language Instructor Training program advisory committee was in place, the committee met every two months. Over time, the frequency of these meetings declined and the committee has not met since the spring of 1992. A few members of the committee expressed an interest in having more regular meetings to discuss matters concerning the program, as one stated:

> I recommend again that the advisory committee have good talks like this one between you and me and put everything on the table. Some things to be discussed could be the sequence, the timing of the courses, et cetera....As an advisory committee we need sufficient time to discuss the technicalities of the curriculum. (Bob 426-433)

Marketing of Program

Recognizing the financial and time restrictions which the staff of the college and LINGA faced in promoting this program, the advisory committee members commended both organizations for their efforts. In considering subsequent offerings of the program, it was recommended that more resources be dedicated to marketing the program:

> The other is that we can do much better at getting students to commit more seriously to the project with more students coming in. I think because of the gradual development and the step-by-step process we did not take full advantage of the capacity of the class and the particular talent of the instructor to get more students into the class. (Tim 221-226)

Scheduling of Courses

The advisory committee members were aware that the lack of financial resources resulted in 'gaps' in the scheduling of the courses. All members applauded the college administration on their efforts to maintain contact with the learners during the times when classes were not being offered. They also suggested that this 'loss of momentum' in the program was the major reason that the learners did not continue their studies. As one member suggested:

> If we can avoid the gap in time the next time around. The motivation is so high and if you have a gap of two to four months the learners will lose their interest and not get it back. They may think it's not really as important as a course they are taking in the university or at another institution. We have to make them feel that there is program continuity. The fact is that the motivation starts to decline and when two or three months pass by, those who lack self-confidence, lose interest. And so perhaps we should have some workshops in-between if we know there is going to be a two to three month gap between courses. (Janet 426-433)

Future Directions for Program

Three suggestions for future activities for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were proposed. These included: the accreditation of the program, the preparation of community-based instructors, and the development of video-tape resource materials to support the curriculum.

Accreditation of Program

The majority of the members of the advisory committee did not see value in pursuing the accreditation of this program since other recognized programs for teacher preparation were offered by the universities. Rather, they were unanimously supportive of these courses being considered for advanced standing as part of other programs of study at the post-secondary level. As one member explained:

> If these teachers want to be accredited teachers then they should complete the same requirements as any other teacher in the province. The college is not in the business of teacher education. I would support consideration of these courses for advanced standing at the college or university level. (Paul, 222-227)

A representative who had been involved with teacher education for many years added:

> I think the fact that there is formal preparation of heritage language teachers when previously there was none, down the road, will make life easier for heritage language teachers who apply for admission to the university. I know in my own case...if someone came to me and said they had been through the program that I would be willing to waive some of the requirements. (Bill 385-391)

Yet another advisory committee member proposed that the Heritage Language Instructor Training program could provide a starting point for those who want to pursue a career in teaching.

> There should be a baseline of certain skills and then a ladder of training that allows people to develop professionally so that eventually they link into the regular educational system...At the very top of the heritage language training pyramid ought to be people who would be recognized as teachers anywhere in a pedagogical system, in the school system or the university system...some of the heritage language instructors being useful in the regular classrooms as teacher aides or in the university teaching environment for language practise. Somebody comes in as a volunteer, now has to learn some basic skills, now is teaching for several years and gets a certain kind of accreditation. Now this person has status and makes more money and keeps going and eventually starts being used in various ways in the Canadian educational system. (Joe 733-754)

Preparation of Community-Based Instructors

The members of the advisory committee, with one exception, were supportive of preparing local heritage language instructors to offer the curriculum. Although this idea had been proposed since the inaugural advisory committee meeting, the recognition that this goal could be achieved was still somewhat of a surprise. As one member remarked:

> ...the students, their growth in confidence also in terms of growth there was a lot of individual growth and development of professionalism. Most of the graduates are really looking forward to the orientation session so they can teach and I think that is one of things I never would have dreamt of given the earlier courses. Not so much because of their lack of content knowledge but just the idea that standing in front of a group and realizing that they have something to say. (Joan 441-449)

The one dissenting individual provided the following reasoning for not supporting the preparation of the graduates of the program to offer the curriculum.

> The qualification is critical to the success of the project so they only mentioned of thinking of allowing their graduates to be instructors. It is impossible because you never allow a graduate of high school to teach high school. I think that the picture which Joan presented is that you can take a graduate from the course to be sort of an assistant teacher. In a course, the instructor could get the graduate to offer one evening and that would be very, very practical. (Tim 422-439)

Videotape Materials

Throughout the course of the project, the value of producing video-tape materials in support of the curriculum syllabus was discussed several times. One advisory committee member who was an avid proponent of this idea commented, "videotape is the way...which provides appropriate followup and I think better quality...I think the possibilities are there but it has to be given the human touch in terms of application" (Paul 232, 242). Although there was considerable support for this idea, financial resources to accomplish this objective were not available.

Working Collaboratively

Based upon their personal experiences as members of the program advisory committee, the interviewees concluded that, for the most part, the stakeholder groups did collaborate in the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

Factors Which Facilitate Collaboration

An analysis of the comments of the members of the program advisory committee yielded 12 factors which considered to be supportive of the development and maintenance of collaborative working relationships among partners in community-based programs.

Process Factors

Four process factors which were revealed as supportive of collaboration were regular communication, conflict management, the ability to be flexible in responding to the needs of the stakeholders, and an understanding of the program.

Communication. All of the committee members stressed the importance of regular communication among the stakeholders. Opinions varied in terms of whether more frequent meetings of the advisory committee were required. Some members indicated that unless there was something substantive to be discussed, a meeting should not be called. Others appreciated the opportunity to discuss the progress of the program on a more regular basis, as one member explained:

> Above and beyond the advisory committee, yes there probably could have been a little more contact, even on an informal basis over a cup of coffee, to talk about what was happening. That relationship, if anything, should be strengthened - because it is very important. We need the expertise from the college, from the educators but also you need feedback from us - we are the "grass-roots". It is very important to have communication. (Bob 466-473)

Conflict management. As one member commented, "There is going to be a certain amount of conflict in a new concept while you iron out things" (Bill 404). All of the committee members could recall moments where there was some evidence of conflict among the stakeholders, however, they indicated that the college staff effectively diffused such situations allowing all to "save face". Several members suggested that these conflicts arose because of personalities and the tactic of focusing on the problem to be solved, rather than assigning blame, worked effectively in resolving these situations.

Flexibility. Ironically, the ability of a community college to offer a program when resources are available and then quickly curtail future offerings when resources are not available, was considered a factor in securing resources for the program. As one advisory committee member explained:

> One of the great things about a community college is that it is able to respond to a need much more quickly. It has to have funding for that need or nothing is going to happen and the minute the need is no longer felt the funding will disappear and so will the program. So, in some ways I think for a community college to offer a program of this nature, in economic terms, made a lot of sense. (Bill 87-94)

Understanding of the project. Virtually all of the advisory committee members commented that the clear understanding of the purpose and issues in the field was a positive influence. In the words of one committee member:

> But with the college we are so grateful at being able to get their full cooperation, and people that are so involved in the making of the heritage language training program. These people know what heritage language is all about it made it easier to convince the key people who are really involved...With the federal government, we have quite a few people who know what we are doing and I just

> hope that they stay so supportive of what we are doing. So if we have a good networking relationship, cooperation, and complete collaboration with all of these parties then I think we will be able to work it out. (Janet 480-488)

Relationship Factors

Data analysis yielded four factors which pertained to the relationships between partners in collaborative initiatives. These factors included commitment, persistence, personal connections, and trust.

Commitment. All of the members commented concerning the level of personal commitment on the part of all the stakeholder groups to the success of the project. The willingness of the advisory committee members to meet on Friday evenings was provided as one small indication of the extent of this commitment.

Persistence. The persistence of the many stakeholders was also proposed as a reason that the Heritage Language Instructor Training was so successful. In particular, the persistence of the college staff was mentioned in this regard:

> So much. There were times when I would say "why will they not even give something" that we can give back in so many ways and that was very frustrating but we never gave up...You [college staff member] were very supportive, you always came back despite the fact and I think that being stubborn is very important to being able to survive. (Janet 498-502)

Personal connections. This group shared the perception of other stakeholders that the personal relationships and rapport which were established ensured that collaboration occurred.

> Well, the students really missed you...you became or you are still a part of them; you were a leg to them if not the backbone. So when they didn't see you they said "where [is she] what's going on" and I would say that there was someone who was taking over...they insisted - to me it is a good sign. (Janet 498-502)

Trust. As a result of the personal relationships which were developed, a level of trust evolved among the stakeholders. As one advisory committee member explained, "Yes the commitment, the involvement, and the sincerity of the people. They trusted us and they believed in what we were doing and that gave us the confidence to go ahead" (Janet 492-494).

Structural Factors

Three structural factors were found to facilitate collaboration in community-based education. These factors were support within the community, strong leadership, and a clear set of terms of reference.

Community support. The advisory committee members stated that LINGA played a key role in soliciting support for and participation in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. They all contended that through the organization's partnership with the program the ethnocultural communities thought that their interests were being represented by their colleagues. As one member explained:

> On the other hand if the project is completely under the department of education, or the university, or the college, then it just becomes a course that everyday people can register in. This may not encourage people to attend, LINGA being in a better position to encourage teachers in the heritage language community. (Bob 453-458)

Leadership. Without question, the members of the advisory committee acknowledged that the staff of Community College provided substantial leadership throughout all aspects of the project, as the following comments reflect:

> The community leadership that is provided by various agencies, whether it be the college (in this case which probably had a finer role), the provincial government and so on... various levels of government are but I think that basically governments provide finances in this kind of initiative. This is community-driven and you have to have one agency in this case it is a college which has managed it. (Paul 83-96)
>
> ...as I understand, the project pretty well has been implemented as had been planned. I think that is primarily due to the leadership, by the college, to make it work. It was well managed. (Paul 66-69)
>
> But I think you have been a driving force...That's for sure - you just don't realize how great the role is that you have given...So you have become a leader. (Janet 521-522, 526)
>
> My last words would be that you have been a good lead person. Without you, I don't think that the program could have been as successful as we have seen it and I hope that the partnership with you will continue on. Even if you were with another division, the partnership with you would continue and we would follow you to that other division and create a branch of heritage languages wherever you would be. I think your expertise has been so important in building our own programs. (Janet 571-577)

Terms of reference. Several members of the committee had developed programs in concert with several stakeholder groups and the general opinion was that such partnerships would become more prevalent. The importance of clearly established terms of reference for all partners in such initiatives was mentioned by several members. In the words of one committee member:

> Well, it obviously requires that all these institutions understand the workings of each other, in a sense that not only do they understand but they accept that various organizations work in particular ways...It is not unusual to have three agencies involved with government funding. As long as the terms of reference are clear, and everybody has an understanding of the degrees of the terms of reference, and everybody shares the same objective. (Paul 267-275)

Factors Detrimental to Collaboration

In response the question of what factors impeded successful collaboration between stakeholder groups in community-based programs, the comments of the members of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program advisory committee identified five factors.

Relationship Factors

The members of the program advisory committee suggested two factors pertaining to interpersonal relationships which adversely affected working collaboratively.

Changes in consultants. The continuous change in consultants was viewed to be very disruptive to the establishment of strong, supportive relationships among the stakeholder groups. Some members thought that this situation, in addition to placing a substantial requirement on all to "bring the new consultant on board" (Paul, 244), provided an opportunity for consultants to provide lesser support to the project because "it was not their original idea" (Paul 245). As one member lamented:

> ...the idea that we had five changes of consultants in the past five years - it was difficult for us to retrain them and tell them what it was all about. In the meantime, it was really impeding the idea of giving us more funding because they had to learn more about us before they could do so... (Janet 475-479)

Vested interests. The committee members agreed that stakeholder groups will want, to varying degrees, to have their own individual and collective interests met. All of the program advisory committee members cautioned about the need to be aware of these vested interests and to not allow the achievement of these to undermine the collaboration among the stakeholder groups. As one remarked:

> I think over and above all these vested interests there is a fair dose of altruism in all of this. I don't want to say it is not there. There are truly people who believe in language learning and giving the kids greater opportunity. There are truly people who believe in cross cultural knowledge. There really is just a meritorious educational value. That in itself is there, but it is not the only reason that makes this whole machine click. There are a lot of vested interests. Everybody, everybody who comes to the meeting has something going on. (Joe 639-646)

Resource Factors

The one resource factor which the committee members identified as having a negative effect upon the program was an insufficient level of financial resources.

Insufficient financial resources. All members of the advisory committee were very aware of the challenges which LINGA and Community College encountered in securing funds to support the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. They contended that this lack of financial stability required that all donate inordinate amounts of energy, resources, and time without appropriate remuneration.

Structural Factors

An analysis of the program advisory committee data presented two factors related to structure which could adversely affect collaboration in community-based programs. These factors were a lack of planning and the restriction of power of stakeholder groups in the community.

Lack of planning. The members of the program advisory committee thought that there was a clear plan in place for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. However, they did not observe a well articulated plan for heritage language activities on the part of the two government departments which provided funds to support such initiatives. As a seasoned committee member remarked:

> All you have is an administrative process where a group comes forward and gets a grant. There is again no planning on behalf of the provincial government department involved. There is no strategic plan, there is no staff expertise, there is no training that they initiate. There are no curriculum materials, what there is are community groups who muster an initiative and pursue their initiative doggedly until they run out of excuses and they provide another grant to allow the community to do that project. There have been endless conferences, endless resolutions of councils and committees, of well meaning academics, well meaning staff inside government. There are people who are sympathetic..and

> appreciative of the work the community does, but when you look at the bottom line after 20 years of programming, there is not much progress and very little to point to. (Joe 242-256)

Restricting community power. In the opinion of the committee members, there was no evidence of a desire by the government departments to empower stakeholder groups in the community. They viewed this restriction of community power as adversely affecting the achievement of true collaboration between partners in community-based programs. As one explained:

> ...provincially, the various ministers, and federally, they all had a limit to how much maturation and sophistication they wanted to give the community, to empower the community. Although the policy was for the community, there were limits imposed after a while from on top. (Joe 521-524)

> I am not totally against the state using this program for its own objectives...as long as they don't totally eliminate the notion of the community having its agenda and its needs. That is where we are today, like when it's grant application time...[the community will] conceal or subsume their priorities to what they have been told to say...everybody plays along the game and in substance perhaps nothing dramatically really changes because people are going to do what they want to do anyway. Everybody is now mouthing a different rhetoric. (Joe 550-565)

> ...I think the government is obliged to at least hear the communities' arguments and to at least try to respond to what they perceive as their priorities...What is happening at the moment is a set of rules being laid on from on top and not all of it is bad but some of it, I think, is inadequate. (Joe 607-615)

Summary

The advisory committee members preferred a contextual definition of heritage language education and expressed concern with the extensive array of terms. They further suggested that the adoption of these multiple terms to describe this aspect of education was for purely political purposes. Clearly, this stakeholder group viewed heritage language education as multicultural education, yet concluded that the adoption of such a classification yielded minimal government resources. The members of the program advisory committee attributed the development of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program to the efforts of Community College and LINGA staff. In addition, they viewed the political context, the existence of other such programs, and research as encouraging government to support such an initiative. They suggested that the efforts of Community College staff; the economic, political and social contexts; and, activities in other provinces as influencing program implementation.

Six stakeholder groups were mentioned; members of the program advisory committee, Community College staff, the provincial department of education, members of various ethnocultural communities, LINGA executive members, and the learners. The program advisory committee members viewed the committee as an effective mechanism to manage conflict among stakeholders. They were critical of the government consultants, questioning their level of commitment to the program and suggesting that the continuous transition of representatives was inappropriate. Despite the drain on volunteer resources, the program advisory committee members thought that LINGA achieved substantial gains as a result of the Heritage Language Instructor

Training program. It was suggested that the inclusion of learners and representatives from the teacher accreditation area of the provincial department of education would have strengthened the program advisory committee.

According to the members of the advisory committee, successful aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program included the achievement of partnerships between stakeholders, opportunities for learners to apply their new knowledge, the cultural diversity of the learner cohort, the curriculum syllabus, improvement of teaching practice by the learners, opportunities for government departments to be actively involved in a community-based program, increased levels of self-worth of the learners, and opportunities for learners to regain a sense of personal status. Four suggested areas for improvement were sufficient financial resources, increased communication, more extensive marketing of the program, and a more compressed schedule for the courses. Three areas for future activity in support of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were identified by the members; the accreditation of the program, the preparation of a plan to prepare community-based heritage language instructors to offer the courses to their peers, and the development of videotape materials.

The program advisory committee members had much to say about collaborative relationships in the community. The factors which they considered to support collaboration included: regular communication, effective conflict management, responsiveness to changing stakeholder needs, and a thorough understanding of the intents of the program (process factors); personal commitment, persistence, personal rapport, and trust (relationship factors); and, genuine community support, effective leadership, and clear terms of reference (structural factors). Factors which these individuals suggested were detrimental to effective collaboration included staff transitions, and vested interests of stakeholders (relationship factors); insufficient financial resources (resource factors); and, lack of planning and restriction of community power (structural factors).

Chapter 7

PERSPECTIVES OF CONSULTANTS

> You have a certain amount of enthusiasm in a community and they know why they are doing that project even though they are not very good at articulating the reasons. Often, in a community project the reasons get articulated at the same time the project is being developed. And that's fine, as long as there is that drive. As a consultant you have to make those choices, whether you are going to interject those resources, theories, and thoughts. But you can also put too much in there and stifle the process of creativity....and the articulation process...You have to achieve a fine balance...that's probably an art almost, a skill that some have and some don't...you can also have it with some organizations and you don't with others. (Pam 328-340)

There was a wide variety of themes evident in the data obtained through interviews with the eight government consultants. While conducting content and thematic analyses of interview transcripts and other documents provided by the six consultants who were directly involved with the program (Ben, John, Karen, Ken, Pam and Sue) further questions emerged concerning the nature of working in partnership with the community. In an effort to obtain a deeper understanding of this concept, the researcher decided to interview two other government consultants (Frances and Kevin) involved in the design and implementation of language programs in partnership with stakeholder groups in the community.

Background of Consultants

During the period 1987 to 1993, six consultants were involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. One individual, Ken, worked on the project for 74 months. The other consultants were involved for periods of time as follows: Karen for 22 months, John for 30 months, Ben for 10 months, Sue for 11 months, and Pam for 14 months. These individuals had worked in the area of multicultural education for periods of time ranging from three to ten years. All spoke at least one heritage language and were actively involved in their own ethnocultural communities.

Frances and Kevin who were not directly involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program had several years of experience in the teaching of second languages and as language education consultants within the public school system.

Definition of Heritage Language Education

All of the consultants were familiar with the government definition of heritage language education. Although they recognized the value of an official definition of the term heritage language, they personally preferred to describe heritage language education within the cultural context. One consultant explained the relationship between language and culture as follows:

> Heritage language education is primarily focused on having a relationship with that particular language, other than it being a language of interest. There is some linkage in terms of your background or relatives. I think you have to have that cultural connection for it to be heritage language instruction. (Pam 4-8)

Some expressed strong sentiments that it was time to move away from this culturally biased definition of language learning. One consultant, who is a specialist in second language education, warned of the consequences of retaining such pragmatic definitions.

> Language education is not primarily for ethnic reasons. It has a pragmatic purpose in serving broader social objectives at the provincial and national levels. In our expanding global economy, we cannot just consider languages as heritage languages, we must consider them as international languages which assist in the development of relations with other countries. (Frances 7-12)

In the opinion of three of the consultants, the continued used of the term "heritage language education" could have negative consequences, in both the short and long term. One consultant proposed that such action could result in the marginalization of heritage language education and related initiatives.

> My greatest concern with the continued use of the term heritage language education is that it will result ultimately in marginalization...If the purpose of heritage language education becomes only that of nurturing cultural diversity then these groups are in danger of marginalization and will not be receptive of involvement of other Canadians in the process. (Frances 42-43, 47-50)

A second consultant stated that by choosing the descriptor of heritage language education judgments would be made concerning the legitimacy and value of this aspect of language education.

> I don't like this kind of labelling and I think actually it serves a bad purpose. It creates a hierarchy of values and claims to legitimacy and I think this is especially true of languages which are offered in the schools. I don't think the categories are that clear and they are often arbitrary. That's my problem, I just think we should talk about language offerings and multilingual education and look at a range of opportunities available in the province. (Kevin 12-18)

Yet another consultant echoed this hesitancy to adopt the term heritage language education, due to adverse judgements being made about the quality and value of this language education:

> I think in the context in which we are using heritage languages right now it is relegated to something secondary. Whereas if we talk about language education it is supposed to be something that is quite acceptable, quite unique, a thing to do, a must to be a member of the global community. It's in vogue, however, when you say heritage languages it brings up the image of mom and pop talk to grandma. I think that the name does not do itself justice. (Pam 21-27)

Use of Other Terms

Several of the consultants thought it timely to adopt terminology which promoted the inclusiveness of heritage language education and that learning these languages could enable people to compete more effectively in the global market. One consultant offered the following suggestion:

> We almost need to see it beyond just learning and teaching a particular heritage language. We are developing resources for a city, a province, a country and enabling us to better handle global affairs and on a day-to-day basis to increase access to services and programs - including essential, crucial services and programs. (Sue 91-98)

The consultants all stressed the importance of adopting terminology currently in use by academics and those actively involved in the field of language education. Frances and Kevin viewed this situation as challenging for the government consultants who were not experts in the area of language education.

Heritage Language Education and Multiculturalism

The consultants expressed divergent opinions concerning the benefits and costs of affiliating heritage language education with multicultural policies and programs. Some viewed this as a natural partnership, as one consultant commented:

> What various groups do in terms of connecting their language to cultural retention or multiculturalism is a varied thing. Generally, policies on multiculturalism will affect expanded language offerings in the school and the legitimacy of expanded language offerings. (Kevin 29-32)

A note of caution was offered concerning the legitimacy of this association of heritage language education with multicultural initiatives in terms of priorities for government spending. In the opinion of one consultant:

> I think heritage languages is being viewed as one of the important things that a culture needs to do to maintain a cultural identity within the larger fabric of multiculturalism. How high it is with government in terms of priorities for multiculturalism, I think it is in the lower echelons. I don't think that, for the most part, governments have identified the potential in terms of business, in terms of being part of the global market. (Pam 41-47)

Others clearly perceived this association as culminating in negative consequences for the future of heritage language education, specifically in terms of adverse public reaction. One consultant cautioned as follows:

> I think that the general public still sees multiculturalism as something esoteric, as separate from their lives...something that is funded out of taxpayers' money that shouldn't be funded. It also ties in with their understanding of immigration - people see multiculturalism as immigrants coming in and taking jobs away from

> the general public and in poor economic times - it is unfortunate, multiculturalism becomes a very negative concept and it is not being seen as a positive reality. And so in heritage language education it becomes important to change the general public's view of multiculturalism and therefore make them more appreciative of the benefit of heritage languages on a practical day-to-day level, as well as on a global level. (Sue 20-22, 27-37)

Two consultants suggested that whether heritage language education is considered to be multicultural education or not is only significant to the extent to which government departments responsible for multiculturalism provide funds to support heritage language programs. One consultant viewed this situation very pragmatically:

> When I start talking about heritage languages in a more generic sense - I guess how those are categorized and by whom is becoming important only so far as the funding - who gets it, who develops curriculum, who has the authority in these areas. Those are all separate issues in which I see different bodies taking some role. (John 23-27)

The other consultant recommended that the definitions adopted by various government departments be reviewed and defined more broadly.

> There is a fundamental need for definition - I think heritage language can be viewed from the perspective of cultural heritage preservation, if you define it that way you will likely be categorized into an area and looked after by a certain funder. This is a time when we need to broaden the definition to incorporate it into adult education. We need to address issues of continuity and legitimacy. (Sue 79-84)

All of the consultants expressed frustration that with changing government priorities having a program categorized within a particular department may limit its future viability, if funds to that particular unit are diminished. The need to be sensitive to the terminology adopted by politicians and government officials was stressed.

Importance of Context

Three of the consultants (Karen, Ken, and John) were directly involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program during the development phase of the project. The other four consultants were actively involved with multicultural programs during this period from 1987 to 1989.

Factors Influencing Program Development

The consultants stated that the efforts of Community College, government consultants and LINGA together with the political context influenced the development of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

Community College

One consultant recalled that he and a college administrator were the initiators of the idea to develop the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. In his words:

> If I remember correctly, this project was my initiative which I discussed with Joe. I saw the need among heritage language teachers to improve skills and Joe picked up the idea and his colleagues at the college designed the program. These needs were not being met by current workshops and conferences. (Ken 35-40)

In contrast, the two other consultants did not view the development of the program from this perspective. They thought that the idea initiated in the community and that another administrator with the college (Wendy) was responsible for developing the idea.

Government Consultants

The government consultants who were involved with the program during the early stages clearly influenced the direction of the program. At the time, resources were available to support heritage language education and this provided the opportunity to focus attention on the needs in the community. One consultant described the nature of this involvement in these words:

> From what I recall there were some exciting moments of talk about the Heritage Language Institute and even our own division...one consultant preferred to be known as a heritage language consultant and was doing some specific work in those areas. So it was a time when heritage language was seen as something that was the wave of the future and so I think a lot of these activities were caused by some anticipation that heritage language's day is going to come and all these activities are going to make it easy and exciting to pursue. (Ben 79-87)

Given this specific mandate to facilitate heritage language education, the consultant was able to address a need within the ethnocultural communities, which in her opinion, had existed for some time. Her answer was the creation of a program to prepare heritage language instructors.

> The smaller ethnocultural communities did not have the resources available to them and I was concerned that these groups did not have a chance to preserve their heritage. I really saw the greatest need in these small communities, they did not have teachers in their group but they did have people skilled in the language who would benefit from learning teaching skills. It would be unfair to just identify the smaller communities ... all the heritage language schools, even those established for many years, could benefit from a teacher training program. (Karen 44-50)

LINGA

As mentioned previously, two of the three consultants recognized LINGA as the initiator of the idea to develop a program to better prepare heritage language instructors.

> Well, I think LINGA right from the start identified, and even the predecessor of LINGA, if heritage languages are going to be viewed as a viable way of instruction as an alternative way of language instruction, then they are going to need a certain calibre of teachers that have the language as well as the tools to instruct. (Pam 69-73)

At the time, both the federal and provincial governments had resources to support heritage language education activities. In the opinion of these consultants, both governments merely encouraged LINGA to access these resources.

Political Context

During the development phase of the program, the politicians also appeared to be supportive of multicultural initiatives. As one consultant recalled:

> I think the Premier came into power in 1986 and I think at the time his government was quite supportive of multiculturalism and there were some foundations which were laid which resulted in the [formation of a government department]...There was some good reason to believe that there was a future not only for multiculturalism but again for heritage languages which were seen as a major component. (Ben 90-96)

Factors Influencing Program Implementation

The consultants contended that the economic, political, and social contexts significantly influenced the implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

Economic Context

All of the consultants thought that the economic environment, both provincially and nationally, affected the level of financial resources available to support program implementation. Two consultants viewed the ability of the ethnocultural communities to maintain the operation of their heritage language schools at a minimum cost to taxpayers as a reason for government to continue to provide resources to support heritage language education. As one consultant explained:

> The fact is also that within the general population, money is tight so the heritage language schools, the way they are operating now is a viable alternative in terms of language learning because they are relatively inexpensive. (Pam 90-93)

The ability of these schools to operate with minimal financial assistance from government assured their survival. As another consultant suggested, this situation would continue to place heritage language education on the periphery.

> Generally, I would say that the atmosphere of the downturn is going to be disruptive. But what we have may not be affected that much because it didn't come out of the mainstream, it came out of the periphery. Individuals and communities made these schools happen. (Kevin 98-101)

The consultants concluded that the willingness of the community-based heritage language schools to operate with minimal government funds allowed some of these resources to be allocated to support teacher education initiatives such as the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. One consultant cautioned that although this was a benefit to the program in one sense, it could mean that "the program would go the way of the albatross since as heritage language schools started to close there would be no need for trained instructors" (John Oct. 2, 1992).

Political Context

The consultants viewed the political context as having a strong influence upon the implementation phase of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. As one consultant remarked:

> If you talk about developing and maintaining a program you are also looking at funding. Unfortunately, often times, politics dictates funding and whether a program will be funded. So if there is a lot of pressure coming from the general public of not continuing certain types of funding for certain types of marginalized programs the chances are that you might see a reflection of that in the funding criteria of the government. (Sue 61-68)

The consultants concluded that changes in priorities within the provincial government affected the implementation of the program. During the development phase of the program, resources were abundant. However, the changing political context adversely affected resource allocation during the latter stages of the program development phase. As one consultant recalled:

> Prior to 1989... We may have been more heavily involved with the heritage language schools directly by giving some guidance in terms of directions and resources. We channel more through LINGA now to be more cost effective from our perspective. We have not increased our grants to the heritage language schools but we have not decreased them either and I have internally fought very hard to at least maintain that grant. I think from what I know we probably will maintain the grant because it's the only thing that's out there. (Pam 106-115)

These changing priorities were supportive of programs that met the needs of multiple stakeholders. Fortunately, a program such as the Heritage Language Instructor Training program which would improve teaching practice was viewed as not only benefitting heritage language instructors but students and the community as well. A consultant who had been actively involved in heritage language education for more than ten years offered the following opinion:

> Ten years ago...I would have said that it was an obligation of the government, both provincial and federal, to support heritage language. .....I still think the government has a big role to play in terms of supporting multiculturalism and heritage language in support of multiculturalism... government can support the development of resources at the community level but not subsidize the cost of individual students. (Karen 14-16 29-31 32-34)

The decision by the federal government to discontinue funding for community-operated heritage language schools was identified as having a negative effect upon heritage language education and in an indirect manner, the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. As schools struggled to balance their budgets, funds were no longer available to support tuition fees for instructors or to pay for substitute instructors. The comment of one consultant, echoing the sentiments of the others, was that the actions taken by the federal government served as a catalyst for the provincial government to take action.

> I think some of the change, I don't want to have to blame my friends at the Feds, but I think that some of what we have seen may have been instigated by some decisions by the federal government. I know that provinces tend to follow their lead. (Ben 101-104)

As another consultant added, once the federal government took action, the provincial government began to reconsider its position. This did not immediately affect funds to support heritage language education.

> Our government too, are very much in a holding pattern, that there really is no sense of why are we doing this. If we cut this funding, who is going to complain? So one of the things that I think is that the cut in 1990 was really a trial balloon to determine if this sector of the community is going to complain and how loudly? What kind of support can they marshall to get things back? Are people prepared to make this a major issue? (John 50-55)

All of the consultants identified as a reason for concern the reluctance of ethnocultural communities to become more active participants in the political process and advocate for heritage language education. As two consultants explained:

> Also I think because of the lack of political influence of a lot of the ethnocultural communities because they are not yet fully participating in the political community (the cuts in funding were made). (Pam 55-58)

> ...the more lobbying from among the ethnocultural communities, the more education of the public of the importance of multiculturalism and heritage language and more, then chances

> are that programs such as this will continue to flourish and be funded. (Sue 70-74)

The consultants expressed frustration that their efforts to encourage members of these communities to advocate for themselves had been unsuccessful. The government consultants contended that because government resources could not be allocated to support advocacy activities, little would be done. As one lamented:

> I get so frustrated. I try to encourage them to fight for what they want. I teach them the skills and strategies to use. I work with them to develop a plan and then they come to me for monies from government to lobby government. (Pam October, 1993)

Social Context

The attitude of the general public towards multiculturalism and the provision of support by government for programs for ethnocultural communities was proposed as a reason for diminished support for multicultural programs. As one consultant commented:

> The general public's attitude towards multiculturalism and everything that includes. It wasn't just a non-acceptance of heritage language, look at the issues around bi-lingual schools...Just a general sense of negativity towards multiculturalism with ethnics and immigrants being labelled as the scapegoats being responsible for taking jobs away from Canadians. (Kevin 110-120)

Stakeholders in Heritage Language Instructor Training Program

The consultants unanimously agreed that the inclusion of stakeholders in all aspects of program design and implementation was vital to the success of the

Heritage Language Instructor Training program. They also suggested that the involvement of these various stakeholders increased the complexity of achieving the proposed outcomes. Four stakeholders were specifically mentioned by the consultants: members of the program advisory committee, the provincial department of education, the government consultants, and LINGA.

Advisory Committee

The consultants all agreed that the program advisory committee worked well together. One consultant, who had twelve years of experience with volunteer committees, offered the following observation:

> I thought it was a good committee because everyone who was there had a legitimate interest in heritage language education. This was dear to their heart. Whether they were from government or the community or an institution, you knew that these people knew that they would go to any degree to get things done. This kind of project had not happened before so it was new for a lot of us....I don't think anyone had any personal agendas, it was more of a group project, a common cause. I think that people worked really hard to accomplish this goal. We all knew each other, we had been involved with LINGA as advisors, so people trusted each other. (Karen 103-114)

Role Confusion

The consultants suggested that at times working with the members of the advisory committee to reach a decision was somewhat cumbersome and that, on occasion, the committee members appeared confused concerning their role. As one consultant explained:

> The confusion was primarily on the part of the LINGA representatives. At times it was clear that the business which was

> under discussion had to do with the association not the program. The discussions which took place about funding did not belong in this setting, these discussion should have taken place between the college, LINGA and the consultants. (Pam, October, 1993)

Department of Education

In the opinion of the consultants, the provincial department of education did not have sufficient resources to assume full responsibility for heritage language education, nor did they view this as appropriate. As one of them commented:

> I don't think that it is conceivable that the school system can contain everything so the heritage language schools will continue to play a role...The high schools can provide an opportunity for continued study of the language, as can the university. I think that all can play a role without any unhealthy competition. (John 169-177)

The consultants expressed disappointment that those department officials responsible for teacher certification were not actively involved in the development of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Given the increased opportunity for heritage language instructors to teach their languages within the school system, the consultants considered this program to be a valuable asset in the preparation of the teachers.

Government Consultants

Comments provided by the consultants concerning their involvement as stakeholders in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program addressed the role of the consultant, the limitations they encountered, and the effect of the change of consultants.

Role as Consultant

The interviewed consultants contended that there is no universally defined role for a government consultant when working with the community. As one suggested:

> I think that it varies from consultant to consultant and sometimes from project to project. I see my role as being a resource and a supporter...you have to believe in what you're doing. So I see my role as being able to provide support as needed and to provide knowledge about the project. (Ben 140-145)

Limitations Faced

Varying degrees of frustration were expressed by the consultants with reference to the restrictions imposed by one's official role. One described the role as that of interpreter:

> As a representative from one of the funders...I see myself as an interpreter perhaps of some of the changes and some of the policies...changes in funding criteria. Hopefully, I'll be able to bring to the advisory committee a general sense of where the [government] may be involved or to what extent the [government] would be involved. If we look at a more long term partnership, how much and how long and in what way. Unfortunately, I can only be the interpreter and often times things do change. (Sue 182-191)

Another consultant described the sometimes onerous responsibility of directing a particular project with the expectation of attaining the objectives of all the stakeholders.

> As a funder you are also involved in certain projects based on certain expectations that your organization has and you are there to make suggestions and recommendations. You want to make sure that those don't get lost because it wouldn't be by any act of intention but when a project gets going it may take a different direction, perhaps for the better. At the end of the project, it is important that the community and government are pleased with the product and that mutual objectives have been met. There is little room for personal agendas or personal opinions held by the consultant. (Ben 145-152)

Change of Consultants

The consultants directly involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program indicated that the change of consultants created further limitations in terms of their involvement with the project. One of the consultants recognized the effect of these unclear transitions.

> As the situation evolved, you see also others becoming involved in the advisory committee. I got into it because we have come to a point in our evolution where we must develop a very clear partnership with some of our traditional clients such as LINGA and so as part of the partnership we needed one particular consultant to work along with them. It reflects upon how our evolution has impacted upon the advisory committee's composition. (Sue 129-136)
>
> I think that I could become more active with the advisory committee especially now that I recently learned that John is looking at other areas of responsibility. I have always looked at him as a key member of the committee and therefore have taken a secondary role, but now that he is overwhelmed with other obligations, he will have to step down and then I can become more active. (Sue 172-178)

LINGA

The five consultants who were actively involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were acutely aware of the consequences for LINGA in undertaking this project.

Financial Pressure

The term-specific, intermittent nature of the funding secured by LINGA to support the project created financial pressures for the organization and some embarrassment when invoices received from the College could not be paid on time.

> It was a difficult position for LINGA. It required the application for a special grant request. The ongoing issue was how to keep things going...As a consequence of the funding issues, it required some serious fast footwork to keep things alive. (John 352-356).

Increased Profile

The consultants unanimously agreed that the undertaking of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program had been a significant opportunity for the organization to be recognized locally, regionally, and nationally. As resources become more limited, the consultants suggested that volunteer organizations such as LINGA would face increasing pressure to undertake such projects, in order to secure funding to operate their offices.

Pride in Product

Based upon discussions with members of the executive of LINGA, the consultants concluded that the Heritage Language Instructor Training program provided a "feather in the cap" of the organization. In the words of one consultant:

> The key word is that they are really proud being involved in this program, they probably would define it as their baby - it may be the most healthy baby they have. Now at this point, as this program is being acknowledged by other umbrella organizations like TINGA it also suggests that it is a very worthwhile program, meaningful at many levels of the word. It also reflects upon LINGA being the leader in doing it in the province. There is nothing negative I can say about it, I always sense a sense of pride. (Sue 341-349)

Stress on Human Resources

Undertaking the Heritage Language Instructor Training program placed considerable pressure upon the volunteer resources of LINGA. The requirements of administering the contract for the project were time consuming and at times the consultants questioned whether the organization could sustain the necessary momentum. One consultant provided some very direct comments in this regard:

> I think that in terms of consequences it could have been their potential death knell. Their membership base is not small but their involvement in terms of doing things for the association is minuscule...I'm not sure that they will have the stamina to maintain that momentum. The downfall of this project for LINGA was that it meant energies could not be concentrated in other areas. (Sue 268-274)

Another consultant mirrored these comments and added that the project required leadership and accountability on the part of the executive of LINGA.

> It was a big change in the level of involvement of LINGA especially considering that they are a community-based organization and was

> an example of partnership between the community and an educational institution...required that they take ownership....and was dependent upon the leadership of LINGA. (Ken 45-48)

Working Together

All of the consultants commented that the involvement of the executive members of LINGA with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program provided an opportunity for members of various ethnocultural communities to work together towards the achievement of a common goal. As one consultant observed, this was a significant achievement.

> This (project) was a major accomplishment. LINGA is a major accomplishment - the fact that they bring a number of ethnocultural groups together to even work on a common project like this is a major undertaking. Even within a particular ethnocultural community there are so many factions and power struggles. (Karen 186-190)

Outcomes of the Program

The consultants were pleased with the outcomes of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. They recognized that certain aspects of the project could have been improved upon, however, they attributed several of these situations to factors beyond the control of the stakeholders involved.

Successful Aspects

Four aspects of the program were noted as successful in the opinion of the consultants, including the cultural diversity of the learners, providing government the opportunity to support the heritage language community beyond individual ethnocultural communities, sustaining hope, and recognizing of the value of heritage language education.

Cultural Diversity

The consultants viewed the program as providing a unique opportunity for heritage language instructors from different cultures to interact and learn from each other. One consultant viewed this exchange across cultures as a particularly positive outcome of the program and hoped that this level of interaction would continue.

> There was the wonderful side benefit of all of a sudden having people together in a room teaching different languages but facing the same issues and making linkages outside of their own community. More needs to be done to create such a situation. (John 343-346)

Opportunity for Government Involvement

This project provided an opportunity for two government departments to provide concrete support for heritage language education. As one consultant reflected, this project benefitted both of these departments:

> It was also beneficial to us as an organization in the sense that a project was at least forcing some discussion which may have not occurred if there was not such a project. Because the project was on the table, and we had to meet and we had to do some contracts, we are discussing directions and futures and John and I always brought it on the table so that it didn't get lost. So that was good. Whatever the future of it may be, I think the discussion will continue.
>
> It was also beneficial in the sense that it provided an opportunity for us to have linkages which may have not been possible. It was an opportunity for us, limited as it was, to sit at the table with the

> [College and LINGA] and the Feds and have a common discussion in an area that is of mutual interest to all of us. It provided some opportunity to network...to the community. (Ben 207-219)

Provision of Hope

The reduction in financial resources to support heritage language education and, in the opinion of the consultants, the uncertainty of public support for multicultural programs, meant that the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, by virtue of its existence, was a sign of hope for the future. As one consultant explained:

> From my limited involvement, one of the things that I remember going back to 1990, was the cuts in funding by the Feds. As a result, there was a feeling of frustration. One of the things that this project did was ignite hope. It was good to see people like Bob, Mary, and Janet, yourself and others who worked hard in the area, this was something to give them a push to indicate that there was still some commitment. (Ben 199-205)

This project "provided an opportunity for those teachers and key stakeholders who are working so hard and assured them that all is not lost" (Ben 194-196) and in the words of another consultant, "re-affirmed our commitment to provide heritage language education" (Ken 117).

Recognition of Heritage Language Education

Several of the consultants emphasized the positive influence of a community college supporting an activity for volunteers teaching in the community. The involvement of an accredited educational institution in this program provided a sense of legitimacy and recognition, as one consultant remarked:

> ...a college offering the program gives teachers who spend a lot of time preparing, who are isolated, who are volunteers, provides them a sense of self-esteem, it's worthwhile, it's recognized that it's an important job and also offers reinforcement in terms of teaching skills and makes their job important and adds credibility. (Sue 270-274)

The provision of an opportunity for heritage language instructors to increase their knowledge and skills related to language learning served to recognize the value of language instruction occurring in the community schools. Reflecting upon her experience at the graduation ceremony for the first cohort of learners, one consultant commented:

> Also, when I was at the graduation ceremony, I was really proud of the people who were standing on the stage, not because they took all the courses, but because they in essence are the first group of people who acknowledged that heritage language learning in the context it is being delivered right now is valuable and has it's place in language learning. I think that it's probably the beginning of something bigger. (Pam 236-241)

Another consultant provided a similar perspective concerning recognition of the value of the community-operated heritage language schools and their teachers:

> That there are more effective teachers in the community schools. Building the skills of these teachers. The commitment is there. These people who sacrifice their Saturday mornings or Friday nights - the commitment is so great. Making these people feel that

> what they do is worth something, that there are people out there who care. (Karen 152-157)

Aspects Requiring Improvement

One area for improvement that was identified by the consultants was the way in which the program was marketed.

Marketing the Program

Several of the consultants recommended that the "program advertising and publicity should be on a larger scale and this initiative should be promoted across the country" (Ken 122). One recommended that to "sustain the program it should be incorporated into the college's base programs (permanent programs)" (Ken 66-71). Another consultant questioned "how aware is the general public that Community College is doing this?" (Sue 289).

Future Directions for Program

The consultants directly involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program provided two suggestions for future directions for the program; the accreditation of the program and the preparation of community-based instructors.

Accreditation of the Program

The consultants all agreed that the awarding of a credit certificate upon completion of the courses in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program would be the ideal situation. Failing the achievement of this goal, assurance that these courses could be recognized for advanced standing towards future post-secondary studies would be desirable. As one consultant commented, "Accreditation for the program would be valuable. This would be a selling point in the long run if these courses could be granted advanced standing status towards an education or social services course of study" (John 362-365).

Preparation of Community-based Instructors

The view that government resources available for the continued support of this project would be limited was shared by all. In the opinion of the consultants, the best use of these resources upon completion of the curriculum syllabus for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program would be in supporting the preparation of community-based instructors. One consultant remarked:

> I think that is important to develop a course...[that] would enable local heritage language instructors to deliver these courses. This approach would be more cost effective and would provide opportunities for heritage language instructors in rural areas where a college or university is not present. (John July 22, 1992)

Another consultant expanded further upon this point:

> The future of delivering this course in our community is limited. There are only so many heritage language instructors to participate. I think that we should complete the second cohort of students, then offer the courses in the southern region of the province. The ultimate goal should be determining a way to share these resources across the country. (Pam March, 1993)

Working Collaboratively

The nature of the work that all of the consultants were engaged in required working in collaboration with multiple stakeholders. Discussions with the consultants concerning factors they considered to be supportive or detrimental to working collaboratively with the community were animated.

Factors Which Facilitate Collaboration

An analysis of the consultant's comments yielded 13 factors which they thought supported the development of collaborative working relationships with stakeholders.

Process Factors

The five process factors drawn from the consultant data were: acknowledgement of the value of the program, allowing for flexibility, articulation of the program outcomes, demonstration of the benefits of working collaboratively, and effective communication.

Acknowledgement. Several consultants commented regarding the importance of partners in such a program acknowledging the legitimacy of the work done by the other partners. One consultant described how, in the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the willingness of a community college to be a partner in the program acknowledged the value of the work done in the community.

> I think that it's wonderful that a public institution like Community College is involved because implicit in the act of partnership is the acknowledgement by the institution of the practical relevance of heritage language. So in one way I think the partnership is very significant, it highlights, the fact that there is acknowledgement of the community educator or at least an institution views heritage language as a relevant part of life here. (Sue 51-58)

Allowing for flexibility. Another factor which the consultants identified was the need for all stakeholders to be flexible and open to change in response to community needs. In the opinion of one consultant, this requirement for flexibility proved challenging when working within a bureaucratic structure.

> How a community is going to work with that government position you can work with that to the extent of how stuck you are in the bureaucracy yourself. If you look at the rules as having to be interpreted as rules, then you are not somebody who is going to be an animator for things happening in the community. You are just going to be one of those people who implement rules and is disliked. I think for a large part the way a large organization ... continues with community projects is primarily for the money. And that's always going to be the case because I think that if organizations had the resources to do things on their own they would not get government involved. I think that's the only reason that government is involved because they can dictate the direction that something is going to take. (Pam 306-319)

Articulation of the idea. All of the consultants commented concerning the time required for an idea to be clearly developed and articulated by the stakeholders. Several suggested that the project was seldom clearly and comprehensively defined at the time that a request for funding was submitted to them for consideration. One consultant cautioned of the need to allow time for these ideas to emerge:

> You have a certain amount of enthusiasm in a community and they know why they are doing the project even though they are not very good at articulating the reasons. In a community project, the reasons get articulated at the same time the project is being developed. (Pam 328-332)

Demonstrating benefits. The requirement to work collaboratively with other stakeholders in the community in the design and delivery of programs is a new expectation for many organizations. The transition to this altered way of working requires a "selling of the concept" as one consultant commented: "Regardless of what program or services or partnership, immediately the first step is to very obviously and practically show the benefits of the other partner" (Sue 393-394).

This explanation of the benefits of working in partnership with other individuals and organizations may require considerable time and energy on the part of the government consultant providing the resources for the program. One consultant described a common reaction to such a change.

> We find that we are doing a bit of running back and forth convincing the community, saying "we are not abandoning you, we're trying to strengthen you" that "you're up to the level of equality, walking hand-in-hand with the government rather than giving you funds and with no questions off you go." (Sue 401-405)

Effective communication. Without exception, the consultants asserted that open communication is essential to the achievement of truly collaborative working relationships. As one consultant commented the open communication between the stakeholders in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program made a difference.

> I think given the circumstances and the limited resources all of you involved did a fantastic job. I frankly can't think of anything that I would want to change. The working relationship was good. We

> were able to talk it out and get a process going and the material that came out was of benefit to the community. (Ben 223-227)

Another consultant added that, in addition to establishing a climate of open communication, the stakeholder groups need to dialogue on a regular basis.

> If I'm working with an organization on something and no one calls me and no one makes an effort to make me a part of what's happening, I would have a real problem. I would also make an effort to find out what's going on but for me, what makes me feel really good, is if I get a really excited phone call from someone who is involved in the process who says "we just got that letter that we've been waiting for such a long time and now we can go ahead and get the processes working." Little things, if I don't hear from people then basically you either don't like what I'm saying (and that's fine but maybe you should tell me that) or you only want me involved on a superficial level (which is fine also). (Pam 347-356)

Relationship Factors

An analysis of the consultant data revealed two factors which positively influenced the extent to which program partnerships would be successful: commitment and personal connections.

Commitment. Without exception, all commented regarding the value of personal commitment when working collaboratively. In the words of one seasoned consultant, "...to some extent it's personalities, connections, channels, and opportunities. The other thing is that you really need to have is four or five very strong people who have a common wish and ask "how are we going to get there?" (Kevin 200-203). Another viewed this commitment by the stakeholders in a given project as more important than the support offered by any government consultant.

> In terms of developing these projects where we give monies to the community, it works because they have a personal commitment to making it happen. Because of the struggles they are all too familiar with, they know that they have to make it happen or the government is not going to trust them the next time. So there is commitment to saving face because the government has entrusted us as an organization with funds. I think it is the strong commitment of individuals and their unrelenting desire to succeed. All we do is provide the funds and some advisement. (Karen 194-203)

Personal connections. The benefit of working with individuals with whom one could develop a sense of personal comfort was mentioned by several of the consultants. In reference to the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, one consultant commented, "What was key to the project being so successful was the way that you and Joan and Janet worked together. It was that bit of chemistry that made things work" (John 347-349). In a more general sense, the effect of the development of this personal connection upon the working relationship was further described.

> I think as you develop a relationship, you either connect or you don't. You can be just thrilled with the concepts that are going on but it you can't connect with the individuals involved then it becomes harder to consult. (Pam 358-361)

Structural Factors

An analysis of the comments of the consultants yielded six factors as being supportive of working collaboratively with the community in developing and implementing programs. These factors were: the assumption of risk, establishing clearly defined roles, having a clear definition of ownership, defining the scope of activity, having a shared vision, and maintaining a quality image.

Assuming risk. The consultants expressed the importance of the willingness of all parties involved in collaborative projects to assume risk. In the opinion of one consultant, the party which assumed the greatest risk in this particular activity was Community College.

> The other thing that makes this work too is an enlightened institution like Community College that was willing to take the risk to do this project - and there was a lot to risk. Government gave the money, LINGA gave the time, but the College risked it's reputation and credibility. This is critical to new initiatives such as this - people willing because of their commitment to take a risk. (Paul 182-187)

Clearly defined roles. In order for partners to successfully achieve their individual and collective goals, the consultants stressed the necessity of clearly articulated roles for all parties which are then documented and ratified. One consultant added that having an individual responsible for holding people accountable for these roles further increased the chance of collaborative programs being successful.

> Where I think in this instance we were able to succeed was we had a person who not only was on top of the project but understood what was required of the project and the roles that each partner had to play. I have been involved in some projects where unfortunately, people didn't understand what role each partner was supposed to play and so that caused some difficulty and had some unfortunate consequences for the project. (Ben 248-254)

Definition of ownership. The consultants viewed the definition of ownership of a curriculum syllabus or related support materials as a matter which could be resolved through a clearly written contract for service agreement. From their perspective, the question of ownership was more than a concern for physical property as one consultant stated, "I think ownership, and I'm not talking just in terms of who holds the rights - feeling that you have a part in it" (Pam 300-301). This desire by stakeholders to "feel a sense of ownership" was further explained by this consultant.

> You can spend days drafting documents which clearly state who owns creative and intellectual property but the bottom line is when people have toiled and given of their own time to develop something, they want to claim ownership. Sometimes, difficult as it is, you have to give up your 'right to credit for work done to empower them. (Pam June, 1993)

Scope of activity. The consultants had been involved with the design and implementation of numerous programs in collaboration with the community. It was the general perception that the more delimited the scope of the program in terms of length of program, number of partners and budget, the greater the possibility of achieving collaboration. As one consultant commented:

> But in these kinds of small projects which have a low status, is where you will find people who are committed. If I were dealing with something larger. There would be all kinds of people with vested interests or no interest involved. (Kevin 221-224)

> When there is a small amount of money it's easier to say "it's a small program, let's just give it the money and then let them go with it." But when you are dealing with a program which is clearly articulated as part of a larger system...then everyone has a idea,

> everyone is watching and it becomes very difficult to do quick turnarounds, to do creative things, just to avoid the level of inertia. (Kevin 226-231)

Shared vision. The importance of a vision for a program which is shared by the various stakeholders in the opinion of the consultants was considered essential to the success of the collaborative programs. One consultant suggested that one needed to patiently await the emergence of this shared vision, without interference.

> From a consultant's perspective I am always very cautious. One of the sentences that I hate the most is "I'm here from government and I'm here to help you". If that is your opening sentence with a community organization then you may as well just pack up your briefcase and leave again. You are there to help to an extent but you are there to communicate their vision. (Pam 301-306)

Quality image. The consultants viewed a college's willingness to support a program in collaboration with the community as being important. As one individual commented, "the value of the College's image helped everyone to benefit" (Ben 115) while another added:

> I mean it quite sincerely there is hope if a community institution like Community College consider [the program] to be an asset and consider it to be worthwhile...then it is possible to attract the attention that the project deserves. (Ben 297-303)

In the view of some, the value of the involvement of the educational institution extended beyond that of merely providing a quality image. As one consultant explained, the college staff provided the necessary support for the program to develop fully.

> ...I think Community College also started to view it from a different perspective, as a community education program. I may be giving the college more credit than is due but I feel that had there not been the support from the College it would not have let the project come to the point it is now - a fully developed program. (Pam 96-101)

Factors Detrimental to Collaboration

Eight factors which interfered with the development of effective partnerships between stakeholders in the design and implementation of programs were identified through data analysis.

Process Factors

Two process factors which impeded collaboration appeared to be token efforts at consultation with stakeholders, and the inclusion of inappropriate amounts of theory in discussions with the community.

Token consultation. Based upon their collective experiences in developing and implementing programs responsive to community needs, the consultants admitted that typically the process of consulting with stakeholders is a token effort. One consultant described the traditional consultation process as follows:

> I think traditionally government at best would have some kind of community consultation and then decide what the community needs, but generally it has been very one-sided. The philosophy in most situations has been "this is what we think from our educated perspective, what the community wants." (Sue 352-357)

Too much theory. A concern was expressed that when consultants provide too much theory, or rationale for the actions of government, the enthusiasm for a project on the part of the stakeholders may be adversely affected.

> You don't want to stifle the community with a lot of theory and what should be good background information, the community may need some of that - I think you have to balance it out so it becomes workable. You have a certain amount of enthusiasm in a community and they know why they are doing the project even though they are not very good at articulating the reasons. (Pam 325-330)

Relationship Factors

Three aspects of relationships with stakeholders were revealed as being detrimental to the development of collaborative working relationships: partnerships which were considered to be forced, token, or unequal.

Forced partnerships. In the opinion of the consultants, developing programs and services for the community in partnership with various stakeholders was a trend which would continue. They cautioned that this pressure to partner would require time to be accepted and understood by all. The comments of one consultant reflected the concern of the others that the time required to develop quality partnerships may not be recognized, thus resulting in forced partnerships.

> With this changing climate, especially with limited resources, there is a push for more partnerships because then you can pool resources rather than having only one source to provide the support. Really there is a shift in paradigm, and there would be a period of lag. This is simplifying it, both sides meaning the government and the community, maybe three sides the community and the formal agencies/organizations, there needs to be a time where they can first of all understand the value of this partnership. It is one thing to force people to enter into a partnership and to see

> the value in it. So there needs to be a benefit for all in this partnership and there needs to be a time of gradual change of attitude and then a gradual development of partnership. (Sue 358-372)

Token partnerships. This implied pressure to form partnerships in order to access resources could also result in the creation of token partnerships which would be mere 'partnerships on paper'. One consultant questioned the validity of such partnerships:

> It's wonderful to talk about being partners in the community but I think that many of the partnerships lack validity. Because it is a loss of power and control and the more groups you have involved and working together on a long term project, the more time, the more commitment that is required. It sounds wonderful - but it's more theory than practice. (Kevin 172-177)

Unequal partnerships. The consultants commented that government contracts are more likely to be awarded to a voluntary sector partner in the current political climate. They added that this situation can create inequities in the resources available to support a project, since members of such organizations have less time to contribute to a particular activity than would those who were paid to do this work. As one consultant reflected upon the challenges encountered in working with volunteers involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, "Some of the glitches encountered were just normal frustrations encountered working with not an ethnic, but just a voluntary organization" (Karen 204-213).

Structural Factors

In relation to structure, analysis of the consultant data suggested three factors - changing mandates, policies, and politics; the desire for ownership by the community; and, the pressure to change.

Changing mandates, policies, and politics. The consultants all commented that politics substantively influenced their work with stakeholders in the community. Working in situations where the official position of their organization was not clearly articulated further complicated their efforts. As one consultant remarked, "... it is frustrating to work with the community when you are unsure what the 'message from the top is'" (Sue April 13, 1992). Another consultant echoed this sense of frustration and lamented the apparent lack of awareness of senior level bureaucrats of this dilemma:

> How do we pursue some of projects when we are not clear that there is an understanding at the top of what we are supposed to be doing, much less at the community level. So it does place you in a dilemma working at the grassroots trying to build something in a structure that is not definitely committed. (John 192-196)

For those consultants who viewed themselves as working "on the front line", this reluctance to clearly articulate policy created frustration and a sense of powerlessness.

> I see myself at the front-line level - we work with the community, we are aware of the policy, the funding criteria, we are also very aware and sensitive to the community needs and situations so the best I can do is simply be an interpreter. It is at times frustrating. At times what the government might do in the near future is often not

> very clear. The policy evolves by being responsive to certain factors which we have no control over. (Sue 324-332)

Community ownership. Certainly the value in enabling the community to claim ownership for a program developed in collaboration with them was recognized, particularly when the individuals involved were volunteers.

> When you get involved in a volunteer organization I truly feel that these people have commitment that goes beyond all else. It's nice when something like this comes to fruition - the only thing that these volunteers have is the product. It can give them a sense of self-fulfilment. (Karen 174-179)

Several consultants questioned whether the attainment of a sense of community ownership was feasible. As one consultant commented, "Community ownership would be ideal but may be unrealistic. Unless there is continuous support from the federal and provincial governments [such projects] could not be undertaken" (Ken 136-140).

Pressure to change. There was unanimous agreement that politics could substantively influence the outcomes of program plans. One consultant proposed that, on occasion, such pressure could result in changes to the intended outcomes of a program and potentially compromise the quality of the initiative. In order to avoid such an adverse effect, time is required to clarify the purpose and outcomes of a project with the stakeholders, as one stakeholder explained:

> Sometimes the politics of the process results in some co-opting in order for the program to be acceptable, or to be endorsed by the

> public. The challenge is one of constantly clarifying with the community partner what the project is about and the intended outcomes. (Frances 127-131)

Summary

The consultants expressed the strongest concerns about the adverse effect of continued use of the term heritage language education. They strongly recommended the adoption of terminology which focused on the economic, political, and social value of learning a foreign language. Although some considered heritage language education to be multicultural education, others viewed this association as tenuous and of limited financial benefit. The consultants attributed the development of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program to the efforts of Community College and LINGA staff. In addition, they viewed the political context and the efforts of the consultants as supportive. They suggested that the economic, political, and social contexts adversely influenced the level of financial support received from the government and, consequently, program implementation. Four stakeholder groups were mentioned; members of the program advisory committee, the provincial department of education, the government consultants, and LINGA. The consultants viewed the committee as effective, however, noted that some role ambiguity existed for the members. They did not think that the department of education had sufficient resources to assume responsibility for heritage language education and had failed to become actively involved with the Heritage

Language Instructor Training program. The consultants clearly recognized the consequences of the continual change of personnel and the lack of clarity concerning their role. More than any other stakeholder group, the consultants considered the Heritage Language Instructor Training to benefit LINGA by providing a sense of focus and accomplishment.

According to the consultants, successful aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program included the cultural diversity of the student cohort, the provision of an opportunity for government departments to work together, and the demonstration of hope and recognition for the value of heritage language education to society. The only suggestion for improvement was more extensive marketing of the program. Two areas for future activity in support of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were identified by the consultants; the accreditation of the program and the preparation of a plan to prepare community-based heritage language instructors to offer the courses to their peers.

The consultants had much to say about collaborative relationships in the community. The process factors which they considered to support collaboration included: acknowledgement of the value of the program, flexibility in responding to emergent needs, supporting the gradual articulation of an idea, demonstrating the benefits of collaboration, and effective communication. In addition, the consultants considered these structural factors to be conducive to collaboration: assumption of risk, clearly defined roles for stakeholders, a clear sense of ownership, a limited scope of activity, a shared vision among stakeholders, and partner organizations known for their quality image. Commitment and the ability to establish personal relationships (relationship factors) were also valued. Factors which these individuals suggested were detrimental to effective collaboration included token consultation and the application of too much planning theory (process factors); pressures created by the expectation of community ownership and changing mandates, policies and politics (structural factors); and, stakeholder partnerships which are forced, token, or unequal (relationship factors).

Chapter 8

PERSPECTIVES OF COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS

> It's exciting because when you are involved in community-based education it is constantly changing, it is dynamic, it's not static, it's very many aspects...the work we do makes a difference and I know that may sound like a cliche but I think that's what it's about, it's a way of involving people in their own solutions. They help to keep us honest in the sense that what we do has to meet their needs or else it doesn't happen again. (Beth 229-239)

There was a variety of themes evident in the data obtained through my interview with the one college administrator (Amy) directly involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. While conducting content and thematic analyses of Amy's interview transcript, as well as my journal notes and interview comments, further questions emerged concerning the nature of working in partnership with the community. In an effort to provide a deeper reflection upon these emergent questions, I interviewed three other college (Beth, Brian and Liz) administrators actively engaged in the design and implementation of adult education programs developed in response to requests from the community.

Background of Administrators

Both Amy and I have been employed by Community College for 13 years. Amy has worked with programs for the physically disabled community throughout her career, while I have developed a wide variety of programs in response to community needs, including several programs for immigrants and new

Canadians. Amy holds an undergraduate degree in recreational administration and physical education, and my academic credentials include an undergraduate degree in consumer behavior and urban planning and a masters degree in educational administration. We are both experienced in the management of projects with term-specific funding and are skilled in program development, implementation, and evaluation.

Over the course of this project, three individuals (Amy, Ann, Wendy) were responsible for the management of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. As the first project manager, I was involved in the development phase of the program from 1987-1989. In 1989, I was joined by an assistant, Ann, who assumed responsibility for the day-to day operation of the program during the period September to December 1990 while I was on educational leave. During this period, my involvement with the program was maintained through participation in advisory committee meetings, development of proposals for funding, and classroom observation. Ann resigned her position with the college in December 1990.

Amy assumed responsibility for the program during the period from September 1991 to June 1992 when I left for a subsequent ten month educational leave. During this second leave of absence, my role in the management of the program diminished. I continued to participate in advisory committee meetings, was contracted to teach one course in the program, and provided advice to Amy, upon request. In July 1992, I returned to the college and resumed responsibility for the program.

Amy was interviewed to provide her perspectives concerning the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Ann was not available for an interview, however, some of her views have been reported as documented in minutes of meetings. My opinions have been drawn from journal notes and comments provided in interviews conducted with other stakeholders.

Three other individuals, two women and one man, actively involved in designing and implementing educational programs in partnership with the community, were interviewed. Beth has 15 years of experience in community education preceded by several years of experience in agricultural extension work. Liz has 10 years experience developing and implementing programs in the agricultural extension field and six years experience in the college setting. Brian has 10 years experience in community education in the college setting. All possess master of education degrees specializing in the areas of adult education or educational administration.

Definition of Heritage Language Education

Neither Amy nor I held a personal definition of heritage language education but rather adopted a philosophy or set of values which provided a sense of direction for their efforts. In our words:

> I don't know if I have a definition or more of a philosophy just from the ten months I had the opportunity to work with the project...The focus is on getting people to maintain their heritage and in doing

> that initially through the acquisition of their language...(Amy 6-7, 11-13)

> I always believed that the definition had to come from the community. Initially, I accepted the definition of heritage language education as established by federal policy. As I worked more with instructors in the community, I came to realize that they held divergent definitions of heritage language education and that these perspectives shaped their goals, their strategies, their commitment. Only recently did I discover that I personally valued cultural retention. (Wendy June 13, 1991)

Heritage Language Education and Multiculturalism

The question of whether heritage language education supported federal and provincial policies pertaining to multiculturalism was viewed simply as a question of whether resources could be secured through the government departments responsible for these policies. As Amy explained:

> I think that it is an appropriate place for heritage language and I see English language training coming out of the education budget. I see heritage language as a multicultural issue because, although it is the teaching of a language, it does end up being cultural. (Amy 26-29)

This emphasis on financial resources caused me to become acutely aware of the political value of terminology as the following comment reflects:

> When the financial support for the project was in jeopardy was when I became aware of the politics of definitions. What formerly had been promoted as a cultural activity which supported cultural retention and identity was at risk when the reduction of racism became the political agenda. It was then that I realized that people were using other terms to describe heritage language education, terms which related to economics, and international trade. (Wendy April 5, 1992)

Importance of Context

All administrators interviewed recognized the importance of context in designing and implementing programs in partnership with stakeholder groups. The question of the influence of the economic, political, and social context upon the development and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training project revealed a variety of concerns.

Political Context

Both Amy and I identified the political context as having a very significant influence on both the design and implementation of the program. The apparent lack of commitment to multiculturalism and related programs by those in positions of political power was disturbing. As Amy reflected:

> Yes, I had to wonder after I watched that program on TV, when the Premier of the province is saying get rid of the department. So obviously within our government people hadn't sold the validity of multiculturalism. I think everybody knows it has to happen because Canada's ethnically diverse population is going to continue but nobody knows how we should live in harmony. We need funds to support the education of Canadians to accept this diversity. (Amy 284-289)

From the perspective of the political context, a further challenge was created by inconsistent messages from people working within the same government department regarding the level of support that they would provide for the project.

> They had initially indicated that there would be more money coming and then as I was leaving, they were "backpedalling" and saying that it was going to come from somewhere else. So it almost seems like the project started off with lots of money and

> because powers that be, whether that be the Minister or whatever, said this is going to be our priority for this one year, two year, three year period, things changed. (Amy 35-40)

Both Amy and I considered the economic and social contexts as having an influence upon program development and implementation. However, we had difficulty making distinctions between the economic, political and social contexts, as Amy revealed:

> To me, it was all so confusing. The constant worry was the further reduction of funds for the program. The media attention given to the politicians seemed to rather effectively build the "red-neck", anti-ethnic mentality. I don't know which came first, the public opinion or the politician's. Certainly when the Premier and the minister were denouncing the value of multiculturalism, people listened to the message. (Amy 290-300)

Stakeholders in Heritage Language Instructor Training Program

For the administrators interviewed, the concept of working with stakeholders was a fundamental tenet of the community education process. Despite this common understanding, variance existed in the manner in which these stakeholders were identified and consequently which individuals were identified as stakeholders. The comments presented are, for the most part, the reflections of Amy and me. Reactions by the other three administrators (Beth, Brian, Liz) to these perceptions are also reported.

Advisory Committee

The program advisory committee which was established for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was structured in accordance with the guidelines established by Community College for all such committees.

Value of Role

All administrators considered the establishment of a program advisory committee as a benefit to the design and implementation of adult education programs, particularly when working in partnership with a variety of stakeholders. One college administrator questioned whether the traditional role of program advisory committees was still appropriate, "I think originally the advisory committees were to give us that grass-roots connection and I think that somewhere we have lost some of that connection" (Brian 97-99). Another administrator added, "It takes a lot of work to work with an advisory committee and to train them to be useful to you as a program developer" (Eileen 163-165).

Changing Needs

Working in partnership with the stakeholder groups through the design and implementation of a program revealed the benefit of a change in membership in the advisory committee to reflect the needs of the project at the time. One administrator, based on previous experience, explained the advantages of adopting this strategy.

> We would have different advisory committee members during the developmental stage of the program than when it was implemented. These initial members were individuals who could participate as part of their job and their time and travel expenses were covered by their employer. Then we would bring in new advisory committee members who were not necessarily required to do as much work. I think that we need to look at the evolving need for an advisory committee over time. (Brian 318-325)

Others noted the need to move away from the traditional model for advisory committees to one which provided more opportunity for active involvement by the membership, as the following comment illustrates:

> I think that an advisory committee on a project such as this if it is truly a partnership. They can't use the 1980s model, they have to have more of a vested interest in what is going on and in fact the purpose of the committee is not so much information sharing and provision of actionable advice so much as it is making decisions about the project. (Beth 188-193)

This move to empower advisory committee members is not without consequences for the educational institution. As one administrator cautioned:

> At the same time, we have to keep in mind that the decisions which come out of the advisory committee have to fit within the framework of college policies and procedures. We also need to keep in mind the areas of expertise and what we look after is the development and delivery of educational programs. (Beth 194-198)

Role Confusion

By involving stakeholders in the advisory committee, the opportunity for confusion of role presented itself. One administrator stated that at times passion fosters such confusion.

> It gets very confusing and often times they are not sure, especially if they are passionate about a particular program. They don't usually translate their passion as much into programs as much as community issues and needs. If that is their love, they will get on the advisory board wearing any hat they can, but the theme doesn't change much. (Liz 157-163)

The members of the advisory committee for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program exemplified this passion. This led to confusion of role, as the following statement suggests:

> There was lots of confusion because of the uncertainty of funding. The advisory committee members wanted to be involved with the consultants and we had a discussion that this was basically an item between LINGA, the college and the funders. (Amy 139-142)

Further confusion resulted for individuals who were actively involved as members of other organizations that were partners in the program. At times, this resulted in discussions that diverged from the agenda for the advisory committee meeting. As Amy explained:

> ... you had a lot of the same stakeholders as were in LINGA and some of the committee members and the board members were the same so as you know you had issues that were with regards to heritage language as a whole rather than looking at the instructor training project. (Amy 125-129)

For me, this role confusion was a new challenge. In my experience in other cases where stakeholders were members of a program advisory committee, they could distinguish between what was or was not advisory committee business.

Issues of Power

All the administrators viewed people involved with advisory committees as being adept at the use of power. Amy expressed a sense of having very limited power compared to the advisory committee members.

> I felt more like a lead facilitator, the record keeper for the department, I was there as somebody who had to continue to provide information concerning college policies, the logistics of the program, how things had to be done within the college and the timelines. (Amy 133-136)

Amy and Wendy also viewed the instructors in the program, particularly the curriculum developer, as being the power brokers in terms of the direction of the program and the advisory committee discussions.

Accountability for Action

Ultimately, decisions had to be made and implemented in consideration of the suggestions of the advisory committee members. To both Amy and Wendy, at times, it was unclear who was accountable for acting upon a decision. As one remarked, "... you gather other people's ideas and a lot of good things came out of that. I guess deciding whose responsibility it was to act on something would have been helpful" (Amy 161-163).

Community-Based Organizations

In the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, LINGA the non-profit organization, was actively involved in all aspects of program development and implementation.

Value of Role

The partnership with LINGA was essential for the college to be able to design a program responsive to the needs of the community. LINGA continued to play a key role during the implementation phase of the program, a role that was valued greatly by the administrators:

> LINGA members, and the students themselves have done a lot to recruit students. We have advertised the courses, but really we have used LINGA as a vehicle to talk at meetings about how things are going, to encourage others to participate. Also, LINGA has supported the students in terms of providing some financial support for them to participate in the courses in addition to the funding that has been offered by the government. (Wendy 129-142)

Growth of Organization

The requirement that heritage language instructors participating in the courses be members of LINGA resulted in an increase in their membership roster. Gradually, the first cohort of graduates of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program became more involved in LINGA activities and it was the expressed hope of the college administrators that "the graduates get more involved in LINGA and bring fresh ideas, energy and enthusiasm" (Amy 261-262).

Increased Profile

The involvement of Janet, the president of LINGA in the development, delivery, and promotion of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was very significant and did much to increase the profile of the organization. As Amy reflected:

> I know that Janet worked very hard and through her presentations she has given the organization a good name and hopefully people now realize that LINGA is committed to making sure that instructor training takes place and are working with a quality partner like the College and an expert like Joan. (Amy 267-271)

Stress on Human Resources

This project placed additional expectations upon volunteer members of the organization who already carried numerous and varied responsibilities. From the perspective of the administrators, Janet was perhaps the most adversely affected by this increased work requirement.

> I think probably the overextension of their president. Their one paid staff member was an office support person rather than being an executive director. Most non-profit organizations have an executive director and staff with the area of expertise and [the skills to perform] the functions...I think it is like any non-profit organization, there are a group who do all the work. (Amy 249-257)

This overextension of human resources also affected Jill, the executive assistant for LINGA. The following comment illustrated the importance of the administrator reviewing the roles of the various partners to ensure that appropriate tasks were undertaken.

> As we go through the courses a second time, one of the intents is to reduce the pressure on LINGA. For instance, last spring we moved the classes to their offices because if they were on campus they would have to pay custodial fees. The other night I realized that they were paying a room rental fee ... And I said to Jill "that's really silly, it was never my intention to push all the responsibility on you". The decision was made while I was away based upon a specific set of circumstances. (Wendy 278-284)

In renegotiating the roles of the various partners in the project, the importance of making all feel valued became evident.

Use of Volunteer Resources

All the administrators identified challenges in working with community organizations staffed by volunteers, particularly in terms of the time these individuals had available to support program activities. Still, the benefit of making these volunteers feel valued for their contributions was noted:

> I think one of the difficulties is that advisory committee members and partners in the community are often volunteers....having a close connection to the project. I think we need to provide them a sense of being valued. The need to know that as volunteers they are on a equal footing to us. (Brian 253-255, 259-261)

When volunteers are not being recognized for their contributions they can adversely affect the success of a program by their actions. The importance of recognizing this need for personal recognition and responding appropriately was articulated.

> There's always the strings attached to a community development program and the signs are there. People belong to these community organizations for different reasons and some of them need a lot of personal recognition for what they do and you almost have to work it so that even if they are not the chairman you are incorporating them as a leader almost, without giving them any power. It's a real balance to make them feel very important to this whole process when in fact they may be your biggest stumbling block. You need to find a way to give them the recognition that they need, some part of it or else they are just going to sabotage the whole thing somewhere along the way. (Liz 43-54)

Educational Institution

A variety of opinions was expressed concerning the perception of the educational institution as a stakeholder in the design and delivery of programs in partnership with the community.

Value of Role

Several administrators commented that it was no longer possible for colleges to develop and implement programs without the support of other stakeholder groups in the community. As one suggested:

> I think the days are long past where a college can take the information in and then design the program on their own. There needs to be that relationship involving those other individuals and determining what the roles are. (Beth 14-17)

Four of the administrators viewed the role of the college staff as essential to the translation of needs in the community into programs. As one explained:

> You and I have a very multi-faceted role to play and it is a pivotal role. Just as the government consultant has a pivotal role and the community leaders have pivotal roles. Our role is to translate the wishes of government and the community into a program. It's like a "y" where things are coming down through us. (Liz 116-122)

Several administrators also commented regarding the value of the educational institution's name being associated with a program and the subsequent assumptions made by the stakeholder groups concerning quality.

Government Consultants

The administrators were very familiar with working together with government consultants. They considered these consultants to be key stakeholders in regards to the program for which they were providing financial support.

Value of Role

Consultants serve an important liaison function among the various stakeholders. In the ideal sense, they are able to provide current information concerning policy directions and levels of support for programs within their jurisdiction. The importance of the college administrators having established rapport with government consultants and communicating with these individuals on a regular basis was stressed by all the administrators. As one stated:

> One thing I have learned is when my government program consultant tells me this is one time funding or this is the direction we are moving, I listen. It means something to me because I don't take them for granted. They are my link to policy and program in government and I believe them. People who have not had my experience may say "oh well, they'll change their mind" or "we'll put pressure on the MLA". I think that my role is to assure the group that I am working with, that the government means what they are saying. (Liz 61-69)

Change of Consultants

During the term of the project, the federal government consultant remained a constant whereas five different consultants from the same provincial government department were assigned to the project. This change in consultants was identified as a circumstance which created considerable confusion. As Amy complained, "We never knew that this consultant was out and that this consultant was now handling the matter" (Amy 77-78).

This transition in staff meant advising each consultant of the history of the project, the intent of the program, present outcomes, and future plans. This task required time and was particularly frustrating when administrators were uncertain of the length of involvement of each consultant with the project.

The government consultants appeared to hold different opinions concerning whether they should communicate directly with the college administrators. An administrator who was not directly involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program viewed this reluctance by the government consultants to communicate directly with college staff as untenable.

> Even if I am not playing a direct role I like to involved in all the discussions that happen between the funder and the community group. When we get to the stage where we have staff involved in the program, I really am reluctant to have the consultant, and the staff and community group chat without me. (Liz 110-115)

Several consultants also appeared hesitant to interact with the stakeholders in the community.

> Their communication to the community was pretty poor with no apparent interest to do some follow-up or that sort of thing. I don't know if that was because of the way that they have been told to work through the community partners and therefore it was the community partner's responsibility to provide that information to an organization like the college. (Amy 79-84)

Government consultants should be able to provide current information concerning policy directions and the effect of changes in policy on the level of support for programs. The college administrator can then reinforce this message with the community partners and seek alternate sources of support for the program. As one administrator explained:

> For instance, if it appears that the government is giving us a zero percent increase or funding will be cut next year, and we think that the need for the program is genuine, then we will look for other sources of funding or ways in which we can lobby government in a small 'l' kind of way. I think that my role then is to point out to them that I think that there is a serious threat to the longevity of the project and to facilitate some discussion for reworking the project for different funding sources. (Liz 73-79)

In the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the consultants did not provide information in writing concerning policies and program priorities. The administrators questioned whether such documentation existed.

Several administrators commented that power which the individual consultant wields could influence communicative behavior in terms of their access to information. As one administrator explained:

> Although from our side we really need to understand what the consultant's role is and be very clear about recognizing that they are not magicians, they are not a money tree, that they have responsibilities within their own system, they face constraints. We need to understand where they fit within the organization because some consultants are more senior than others or may have more scope of decision making and more discretionary power. (Beth 133-140)

Learners

In the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the future participants in the courses were actively involved throughout the development of the program. The opinions of heritage language instructors as prospective learners were the key source of data in constructing the competency profile for a heritage language instructor. Learner opinions also influenced decisions such as the criteria for accepting students into the program.

> As a result of learner opinions, [we] decided that we would not have an ESL requirement.. We would not assess heritage language fluency of individuals coming into the program...which certainly has had some consequences for instructors in the program...Certainly, heritage language instructors had a key role in determining the competency profile for a heritage language instructor... (Wendy 129-135)

This level of prospective learner involvement in program design was viewed by some as atypical of non-credit courses offered in partnership with the community. One administrator commented:

> In the work that I do, it is hard to involve the participants in the development because they are very transient by nature. What I have been doing, although they may not be the same stakeholders, I always get participant feedback as a representative voice. (Liz 183-187)

Outcomes of the Program

Both Amy and I viewed the Heritage Language Instructor Training program in terms of successful aspects of the project and areas for improvement should such an initiative be undertaken again.

Successful Aspects

Overall, we considered the Heritage Language Instructor Training program to be very successful. This success was attributed to the actions of the learners, the college staff, and the community.

Application of Learning

Both Amy and I were surprised by the extent to which the learners understood the material presented in the courses and applied it in their own classroom environments. For one of them, it was especially rewarding to witness the development of the pedagogical knowledge and skills among those who were not formally prepared as teachers. They agreed that the focus on practical skill development throughout the curriculum was appropriate.

Cultural Diversity

Initially, it appeared that the learners chose to keep to themselves or to only interact with others from their same ethnocultural community or language group. As Amy recalled, "Our ethnic groups did not mix. All the Spanish students sat together... to me this was really unfortunate that they would not try to develop some friendships if we are talking about multiculturalism" (Amy 238-240). This conclusion was later questioned as learners progressed through the courses and the following observation was made, ".. they all seemed very keen about supporting each other or wanted to. When the Filipino dancers were at the mall, some of the students said that they would be shopping at the mall on Saturday and would stop by" (Amy 240-243).

Flexibility

Essential to the continuance and success of the program was the ability of all stakeholders to be flexible in response to changing needs. Both administrators found all involved with the project demonstrated flexibility. As one commented, "...we the stakeholders, in order to see the program succeed, bent over backwards to provide compensation or reorganized whatever so that everybody could attend at the most convenient times" (Amy 189-191).

Leadership

In addition to the transference of the pedagogical skills learned in the courses, many of the heritage language instructors assumed new responsibilities within their ethnocultural communities. This development of leadership skills was very exciting to observe.

> It's really exciting to listen to the graduates talk about not just the improvements in their teaching skills but to hear stories such as the ... community that managed to get two groups to work together, recruited six teachers, found a free facility. Those changes were as a result of the increased self-confidence and skills of one of the graduates. (Wendy 228-232)

As the learners shared their stories of what new initiatives they were actively involved with in their communities, they also described the leadership they were providing in support of these activities.

Aspects Requiring Improvement

As with the design and implementation of any program several areas for improvement were identified in retrospect.

Financial Resources

Financial resources to support the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were uncertain for extended periods of time. This created a preoccupation with financial aspects of the project. Amy indicated that this situation impaired her ability to identify what aspects of the project could have been improved upon and stated, "this is a hard question to answer given the way the funding was received" (Amy 187).

The administrators were continuously reminded of the financial status of the program by college staff. They received a telephone call every few days to determine whether the monies from the provincial government had been released to LINGA.

Marketing of Program

Due to limited financial resources and limited time to develop and publicize course schedules, the marketing of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was a meagre effort. As Amy admitted:

> I don't know if it was just my perception, but we didn't seem to have the time to advertise except through LINGA. We had this group and then we had a few new faces at every course, not a lot. But we didn't have the time to advertise the program, we relied a lot on the instructors to check with other heritage language instructors to ask if they were interested in participating in the project. (Amy 206-211)

Scheduling of Classes

The lack of financial resources affected the scheduling of courses. When confirmation of funding was received, the result was that " We quite often scrambled to organize the classes and offer them. This caused some heartaches for the students" (Amy 188-189). If the program had a more stable financial base, then Amy and I would have planned more proactively. As she reflected:

> Given the opportunity to lay it out, a patterned effect might have relieved some of the stress, or the difficulties, or the complaints. A lot of the students were working fulltime and had other commitments and so it was really hard to keep that key group of twenty individuals constantly going so that they could graduate. If you were to set the schedule so that courses were offered over a three year period with the opportunity to complete the program within three to five years, it may be helpful. (Amy 192-198)

Future Directions for the Program

Two areas for future activity in support of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were identified by Amy and me. The first was the development of a program accreditation strategy. The second was the development of a program to prepare community-based heritage language instructors to offer the courses to their peers, locally and across Canada.

Accreditation of Program

The courses in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were designated as non-credit. As such they were not part of a recognized certificate or diploma program offered by Community College. The decision to offer these courses on a non-credit basis was, in the opinion of both Amy and me, a matter of expediency.

> Over the last five or so years, as resources have become more limited, we have seen fewer and fewer things granted credit status. One of things that we found has worked for some programs, is that if we started the activity as a non-credit one, had a group of students complete the activity and had the community lobby the government, then the program may be granted credit status and

> the previous graduates are granted advanced standing for the courses they completed. (Wendy 29-37)

In an effort to ensure that the curriculum could be granted future consideration as a series of accredited courses, certain strategies were employed by the administrators.

> When we were designing the course, we asked ourselves whether we should give assignments and whether these assignments should be marked. Part of the plan was to organize things in such a way that if there came a time when we could award credit, then we would be able to state that the students had done these assignments and completed these hours of study. (Wendy 10-15)

Preparation of Community-Based Instructors

Since the inception of the project, the stakeholders expressed interest in offering the Heritage Language Instructor Training program in an economical manner. The possibility of offering the courses in other geographic locations had also been discussed several times. Reliance upon academics based in the local area would render both of these plans impossible to accomplish. To this end, a plan to prepare local heritage language instructors to offer the curriculum was proposed.

Interest in offering the curriculum in the southern portion of the province was expressed continuously almost since the inception of the program. Amy and I supported the brokering of the curriculum to other regions with a very strong condition that the host institution not alter the curriculum. We both grew frustrated with the time required to establish such agreements.

> So things like TINGA now being supportive of the program will help. Just to let you know how long it can take to get support, for two years we have been talking with TINGA and encouraging them to use the curriculum which [the government] has paid for and has been tested, and to find a host institution in [their area]. (Wendy 45-52)

Working Collaboratively

Much of what the administrators learned about collaboration was a result of day-to-day interaction with the stakeholder groups. Yet, all experienced difficulty in describing the process of collaboration.

Factors Which Facilitate Collaboration

An analysis of the administrator data revealed 21 factors which appeared conducive to establishing and maintaining collaborative working relationships in the design and implementation of community-based programs.

Process Factors

Five aspects of process identified as supportive of collaboration were articulation of the idea, celebration of achievements, clear communication, continuity in stakeholders, and documentation.

Articulation of the idea. During the early stages of developing a program, the administrators stressed the importance of keeping the process very flexible. The need to document the ideas of all stakeholders was mentioned as was allowing time for the plan to emerge. One administrators explained this process as follows:

> In the initial stages of project development, I do most of the communicating verbally, I'm reluctant to write things down because once they are written down, it seems that it leaves the discussion

> stage and enters into a more formal, concrete notion... you need to keep the government consultants informed verbally through telephone calls, through lunch, invite them to a meeting so that they can meet the people I am working with - I find that very effective. (Liz 87-99)

Celebration. Celebrations occurred on a regular basis in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program whether it was to mark the end of a course, a birthday, or some other occasion important to the learners. Celebrations help to unite stakeholders in community-based programs as two administrators suggested:

> I think there has to be a common joy in celebration, that you recognize the accomplishments and that you reward the achievements. (Beth 308-310)

> I wondered why Janet wanted to have a reception for the students in June when graduation was planned for September. But this evening after attending the function, I realized that she was wise to do so. For all but one of the future graduates, their courses are completed and that accomplishment needed to be celebrated. (Wendy June, 1992)

Communication. The value of clear, open communication in fostering collaboration between stakeholders was stressed by all of the college administrators. As Amy remarked:

> I think the opportunity to have some more face-to-face interaction and to understand the process within which they are working. Given the program that I am in now, we quite often get groups together who are receiving funding to talk about new initiatives or to talk about how the plan is changing or the organization is changing. (Amy 73-77)

Continuity. Continuity in stakeholders provides the opportunity for growth and development of individuals, organizations and partnerships. One administrator described this development of a team as one of the more rewarding aspects of working with stakeholder groups.

> I like to see growth and development as well and I get to see that sometimes in working with the community. Especially if you get to work with the same people over time and they mature as a team and they can forget all the peripheral reasons why they are involved and concentrate on the project and the good of the student...I enjoy that, watching them struggle with their reasons for being involved, and watching them put away their own stuff, their own power and prestige and put that aside for the good of the group. It's fairly rare. (Liz 289-300)

Documentation. Even in situations where continuity of personnel is present, clear and comprehensive documentation of the program development and implementation process is an asset. The administrators commented that the responsibility to provide quality documentation is best assumed by paid staff members. For one administrator, assuming responsibility for documenting this process was imperative.

> I like to do that, to be the one who is coordinating the actual written part of the development of the proposal. This can sometimes be a threat to the community organization but it is just the way I like to work...I make sure that I record all of the ideas so that when the first draft comes out people can see their words, so they know that I was paying attention and I think that helps them start to trust me. (Liz 367-369 374-377)

Several administrators spoke of their disappointment when the support which they provided to a community-based program was not recognized. Both Amy and I expressed frustration with this circumstance.

> It's one of those silent roles we play. The executive of LINGA saw themselves as preparing proposals and reports, which they did - for the operation of their organization.. They relied on the college to prepare materials related to the Instructor Training program. Actually, it was better that they did so, I just wished some LINGA members had acknowledged this contribution. (Wendy March 27, 1993)

> Are you just there to offer a facility and a mechanism to offer the classes or are you really a partner in the project who is out there trying to determine what is happening and to get to know the student group? (Amy 163-166)

Relationship Factors

In terms of relationships between stakeholders in developing and implementing programs, the administrators stressed the value of commitment, confidence, equality, passion, personal connections, reciprocity, respect and trust, and sharing success.

Commitment. Commitment is a vital element which can carry programs through times of adversity. As I recalled, "Interest and commitment has taken us a long way at times when we had some dilemmas with funding and concerns whether students would register for the classes" (Wendy 156-163).

Another administrator warned that waning commitment be regarded as a signal that the needs of a stakeholder are not being met and this should be addressed.

> Commitment to the project, definitely that is another aspect. As we begin to set meetings concerning the project, I can understand if someone cannot attend a meeting but if they begin to back away by not attending then they are beginning to make a statement. (Brian 279-282)

Confidence. For collaboration to be effective, stakeholders must have confidence in these relationships. As one administrator contended, this confidence serves as an impetus to further develop the relationship, "We need to have confidence, the more confidence we have I think the more energy we put into the relationship too" (Beth 150-151).

Equality. Partnerships are by definition built upon equal sharing of responsibilities. In the opinion of one administrator, this requires that "There really has to be an equivalent position between the partners. Partners have to be aware of their responsibilities in writing and be willing to be accountable for fulfilling these responsibilities" (Beth 250-253).

Passion. Several administrators cited incidents where the commitment by the stakeholders could only be described as passion. One reflected upon the value of passion as follows:

> Passion is important for the community - nothing much happens if they don't care about it. That's what makes it exciting to work with people from the community. They are the ones who are trying to make a change right in their neighbourhoods and we are assisting in that. (Liz 168-172)

Personal connections. All of the administrators suggested that working collaboratively required exceeding the level of professional interaction that one would typically have with stakeholder groups. As one individual explained, it requires taking the time to get to know people on a personal level through "...social chat with people before and after the meeting to find out what their lives are like and how are they connected with the project and this group outside of the work that we are doing" (Beth 38-41).

For the administrators involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, personal connections were developed by becoming involved in activities with a variety of ethnocultural communities and organizations. As I reflected:

> On my part, it meant doing things differently as far as community education process in terms of commitment and participating in other events in the community, such as graduations for other schools and LINGA meetings. I think the trust became a real factor because so many things were happening in the community. (Wendy 280-285)
>
> It was a delicate balance to not appear to favor one group or another. Attending these functions helped develop a trusting relationship with individuals in the ethnocultural communities as well as to learn more about the cultural practices and values of the group. (Wendy September 26, 1992)

Reciprocity. Reciprocity in a relationship with any stakeholder is valued. However, the administrators tended to place more importance on reciprocity in relationships with government consultants providing funds for programs. Two perspectives were provided concerning such reciprocity.

> Ultimately a good relationship would be that it is reciprocal, that I would be receiving information from the consultant, so far I find that most of the contacts at the funding sources are so swamped that they are not communicating to us that these are opportunities you may want to pursue. (Brian 57-61)
>
> Often times I will receive a request from a consultant to submit a proposal for a program during the last quarter of their organization's fiscal year. The consultant wants to see the monies allocated to something that will benefit the community instead of

> having to return the unexpended resources to the government. I get the chance to do something for the college and the community. (Wendy June, 1993)

Respect and trust. Respect and trust were identified as essential to relationships between all stakeholders. One administrator commented that the development of these qualities in a partnership required considerable time.

> Usually there has been some kind of relationship established between the various partners so that there is an opportunity to build a sense of trust. There needs to be communication that can be valued and valuable. There needs to be an appropriate level of confidence and trust in the interaction between the parties before any kind of a partnership or program can transpire. (Beth 4-10)

Another administrator suggested that in order to achieve this sense of trust in a relationship, honesty and discretion were also important.

> I think that a very positive relationship would be one where there is a good, honest level of communication, that you talk about the same things, that you are honest, that there is a sense of trust on both sides, that you know that you can work together, that there is a level of confidentiality about the work that you are doing, that there is a good sense of discretion. (Beth 141-147)

Respect and trust, beyond a rudimentary level take time to develop. For one administrator, reciprocity was a key aspect in the development of both respect and trust.

> So the key elements that underlie that are respect and trust and it is not something that happens overnight. Trust that the community group will play by the rules and that they won't be entering into the same kind of relationship with another college just to see who can do it for the least amount of money. Respect, that they know something about the kind of work we do and they want to be involved in that kind of work. They don't just want to buy something off the shelf, they want to be involved in program

> development. That they respect the way that we do this work and we need to respect them too, for what they have done in the community. (Liz 334 - 344)

Sharing success. In the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, as with most programs offered in collaboration with the community, the stakeholders wanted to share in the success of the program. Administrators commented that it is important to recognize this need and to acknowledge it in a manner acceptable to the stakeholders. In the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, I reflected:

> It has become "the baby", in the words of many of the people I have interviewed in the last few weeks, of LINGA. Through this partnership, LINGA as an organization has something they can point to saying "We were responsible for this happening, it is working well, and it is something we would like to share with others." (Wendy 164-179)

Resource Factors

The data provided by the administrators yielded identified four categories of resource requirements: the need for adequate funds, the importance of adequate human resources, the need for reflection, and the allowance for sufficient time to work collaboratively.

Adequate funds. All the administrators noted that as financial resources are becoming more limited, funds for a project need to be solicited from several sources. In the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the coordination of these various grants resulted in periods where funds were not available and classes had to be cancelled. Restrictions in terms of how the funds could be used caused a further stress on resources. As Amy commented, "... the budget covered the instructor fees and a few supplies but it did not include time for college staff" (Amy 205-206).

Adequate human resources. Limited financial resources can adversely affect allocation of human resources to a program. In order for programs to be successful, it is important that the human resources complement be realistically determined and that a dependency on one or two individuals not be developed. As I noted in the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, "...we need to broaden our resources because we can't rely solely on Joan to teach everything or for me to hold everything together" (Wendy 287-290). Amy commented further concerning this situation:

> I think that she took on more teaching than we originally planned because she developed the curriculum, she thought in some ways that it was easier to teach it than to give her notes to someone else. It was very stressful for her. (Wendy 185-187)

Opportunity for reflection. All the administrators expressed the importance of time for reflection when working with programs which involved multiple partners and stakeholders. As one remarked:

> Time is also needed for reflection away from that group. You need time to think about who said what, what did they mean, a lot of introspective analysis on what is going on with the project that has nothing to do with the program. (Liz 355-358)

In order to provide a more objective evaluation of community-based programs, one administrator advised, "Often we are too close to the project to be able to reflect critically. We need to get another person's perspective, somebody who is outside of the community" (Brian 237-240).

Sufficient time. Most often program design and implementation is accomplished within a limited period of time. When involving stakeholders in the process more time may be required than is available. One administrator shared a strategy to 'extend' the amount of time available.

> You need to have the time and very often you don't get the time because the turnaround is short and you are asked to get something up and running before you really have good relationships established. So I have addressed that with people and said that we are 'up against the wall' and we need to do something and we are really not ready so here is what I am proposing in the interim. (Liz 334-351)

Structural Factors

The administrator data revealed three aspects of structure which positively affected collaborative working relationships. These aspects included: clearly defined roles, a common definition of ownership, and shared values.

Clearly defined roles. All the administrators agreed that in order for partnerships with stakeholders to be effective, the roles of all partners must be clearly defined. As one stated,

> If you are going to have partnerships, then those partners better get together and define their roles and how they are going to communicate and lay out some of their assumptions and expectations and that kind of thing. (Amy 86-89)

The process of role definition, in the opinion of the administrators, required time to achieve.

> It takes more than one meeting for everyone to know what the jurisdiction of everyone else is. I think that is important whether it be stakeholders or advisory boards or whatever that people who come to the table know what the limit of their role is. (Liz 420-424)

Failure to attend to this definition of roles can have negative consequences for program implementation. As one administrator cautioned, "Without taking the time to clearly define these roles, I think it is very difficult to continue the implementation process and attend to all of the things that are necessary". (Beth 295-298).

Definition of ownership. For the Heritage Language Instructor Training program the determination of ownership of the program was a lengthy process. Early definition and a common understanding of ownership of the program would have aided collaboration. Several administrators had encountered challenges in this regard in other programs and strongly recommended the acceptance of a common definition of ownership by all stakeholder groups.

One administrator proposed that ownership of curricular materials and other products of community-based programs will become more of an issue as resources become more restricted.

> I think ownership is a difficult aspect of our work...The question of whether the funding source will retain curricular materials and have the right to distribute them elsewhere I think will become more of an issue as resources continue to diminish...the question of ownership needs to be clarified at the very beginning of the project. (Brian 161-170)

Variance existed in terms of the willingness of the administrators to relinquish ownership of curriculum materials. Only one administrator admitted an unconditional willingness to freely share such resources.

> I have been told by the program consultant that any curriculum developed using government funds must be shared if they ask us to...I don't have a problem with that really. I'm trying to think why that would be a disadvantage for us. We would still have access to the curriculum if we wanted to run it. It is unlikely that we would run the program without the support of the community group anyway, so I don't see it as an issue for me. (Liz 271-282)

The remainder of the administrators were concerned that relinquishing ownership of curricular materials would have short term and longer term financial consequences for the educational institution. As one explained:

> We are contributing more of our professional time to the development of curriculum due to diminished budgets. I don't think we should be giving away the materials we are developing to the funders when the college is providing additional resources. I think that there has to be more discussion of these points in advance of signing a contract. (Brian 171-177)

Shared values. In order to maintain a positive working relationship over time, one administrator commented that it requires, "...shared values and there probably needs to be an agreed upon vision" (Beth 303-304). These shared values must be negotiated between all partners. Another administrator suggested the necessity to give consideration to the values of all the participating organizations particularly those providing financial support for the program.

> If it is something that is related to the funding where we need to work with a community agency in order to secure funding, then I think that it is important for us to understand what the values are of the agency we are working with and also of the funder. (Liz 5-9)

Factors Detrimental to Collaboration

The analysis of the data collected from the administrators identified 11 factors that they thought interfered with the development and maintenance of collaborative working relationships between stakeholders.

Process Factors

The one process factor which the administrators described was the existence of unclear communication channels.

Ill-defined communication channels . For the two administrators directly involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, many challenges were created by the hesitancy of four of the six consultants to define the communication channels. As I reflected:

> When I first started working with the consultants I thought they were playing avoidance games and that they had this secret document that would tell all. Then I began to wonder if they had the plan of the week which was constantly changing. Talking with the consultants was like volleying a tennis ball. (Wendy 280-283) For the college it was an interesting undertaking because as an institution you are used to holding the power, the control, the funding, et cetera. On this project I felt like a third party, which made it difficult to speak with the consultants. (Wendy 182-186)

Relationship Factors

Five aspects of relationships with stakeholders were suggested as being detrimental to the development of successful collaborative working relationships.

These were: "being used" by other partners, competition, forced partnerships, formal relationships, and unequal partnerships.

Being used. Some organizations will partner with others for the sole purpose of securing resources for a program. At times, such partnerships result in substantial conflict and the use and/or abuse of members of the organization. As one administrator commented:

> Some groups are very difficult to work with and we are not going to succeed with everybody...Some groups are trying to use us and figuring that out sometimes is kind of rewarding. (Liz 303-306)

Competition. Collaboration will not occur in situations where organizations or individuals are competing with each other for resources. Such partnerships may be formed not because people choose to work with each other but rather for purposes of securing resources. In the words of one administrator:

> When you can't win and you can see the writing on the wall that no matter how hard you try, the community members are not going to get along with each other. They have some long standing reason for not participating and what is bringing them together is money from a government source, which is a very poor reason to come together...So that's frustrating when somehow it's going to end up looking like you didn't do your job properly. (Liz 314-323)

Forced partnerships. As one administrator stated, "partnerships are very time consuming and people demanding. If the funding source were to provide us with funds with no strings attached, I think that there would be a change in our partnerships" (Brian 292-295).

Another administrator echoed this sentiment that partnerships are being formed due to pressure exerted by the organizations providing funding for adult education initiatives.

> These groups are not coming together because they have genuine respect for each other, that is something that has to be built along the way. They are coming together because the funder is saying that they have to come together. (Liz 457-460)

Formal relationships. Partnerships have been part of the tradition of community-based education. With the recent trend to promote collaboration and partnerships between providers of programs and services, a move towards a more formal structuring of these relationships has occurred. As one administrator reflected:

> I think that there are a lot of ways that you can do that without formalizing relationships. Now a lot of funders are saying let's formalize... The formal linkage creates new dynamics that have not been traditionally part of community involvement in community education, or adult education, or extension. People have been involved in the past because they were passionate stakeholders and you still had some ups and downs but you didn't have the political strings attached. (Liz 440 447-452)

Yet another administrator commented, "I think that there is something that has been lost in having the formalization of these connections. The increased pressure to be politically safe and to ensure full representation requires that we be very aware of cultural sensitivities" (Brian 351-355).

Unequal partnerships. Two administrators noted that partnerships may develop which are not true partnerships since responsibilities are not equally shared. As they explained:

> People have been very willing because they are up against the same kind of thing but what occurs in situations like that are very unequal relationships. It's important for us when we enter into these things to articulate who is going to do what and why we are really doing this. I find that if you are the one who is looking for the partner you will probably end up doing 95 percent of the work. (Liz 463-470)
>
> Hard work and the hard work has to be done by all of the partners, if you get into a relationship where one person feels like he/she is doing it all and giving, giving, giving and others are not then the relationship tends to break down. (Beth 304-308)

Structural Factors

The comments provided by the administrators revealed five potential hazards to working collaboratively with the community in developing and implementing programs. These factors were: an inaccurate assessment of the need for the program, an intolerance of imperfections in the program, "twisting the plan", unclear expectations, and rules that are not known to the partners.

Inaccurate needs assessment. The administrators expressed concern about the failure of the government consultants to recognize the nature and extent of the need for a program as perceived by the stakeholder groups. In the case of the Heritage Language Instructor program, this lack of vision resulted in funding for the program being received on an ad hoc basis with resultant gaps in the scheduling of the courses. Amy was dismayed that the consultants did not clearly identify the extent of the funds available and suggest other sources of support.

> They tended not to look beyond, once the program was established, to determine what kind of ongoing funding was available. Usually after you have operated something for three years, the need does not stop after three years. Something had been established and there was increased awareness and something was wanted as far as continuing education for those instructors that are getting on board. (Amy 40-45)

Intolerance of mistakes. One administrator commented that "mistakes are a normal part of working with the community. You cannot control human beings" (Brian 205). For me, the reaction of the other stakeholders to these errors proved stressful.

> Many who are working in the field say there will always be the "glitches", but we still reached the outcome, we still reached the agenda. It is interesting to see the perception of those at the community level, who have not had the experience, and are actually quite frustrated by the "glitches". (Wendy 105-111).

"Twisting the plan". In circumstances where financial resources are limited, the administrators noted that programs may be developed in such way as to meet the criteria to receive financial support but not be responsive to the needs of the stakeholder groups. Amy spoke of the pressure to present programs as new and innovative in order to secure funding.

> The other problem, the other thing that I did hear from Janet, which she reiterated from the consultants was that because they were only funding new initiatives, that you had to look at what you were doing and give it a new "slant" in order to get the funding. So it really gets back to that three year limit and after that if it was not something new or something that grew out of something old, then they were not interested. (Amy 61-66)

Another added that this pressure for a program to conform to criteria established by the organization providing the funding could result in organizations undertaking projects to which they are not truly committed.

> That's when you get the politics and people are going after things for money that they don't necessarily intend to spend on the educational project. They don't always have the right kind of project in mind for what they want to do but the agency sometimes twists it around a bit so that it meets their objectives. (Liz 441-447)

Unclear expectations. In order for collaboration to be achieved all partners in the project need to clearly understand the expectations for their own performance, the performance of others, and the intended outcomes of the project. In the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, unclear expectations resulted in the delay of the completion of the curriculum document by several months as I recalled:

> The curriculum syllabus was submitted to John in March, 1991. In July, he indicated that the document did not meet his expectations and the revisions were agreed upon. The revisions were submitted in December 1991, and in April 1992 the funds which were outstanding since March 1990 were finally released. If only the expectations for the content and format of the curriculum syllabus had been specified in the contract in March 1990, the project could have proceeded more smoothly. (Wendy June 15, 1992)

Another administrator stated that confusion can also exist between partners in the community simply because they do not understand the terminology used by other partners. For example:

> Sometimes they don't have an understanding of the difference between an educational intervention and some other type of

> societal intervention out there, like counselling or therapy or community outreach work. (Liz 402-405)

Unknown rules. If rules which will influence the implementation of a program such as those which govern the provision of funding are not clearly stated, the achievement of a truly collaborative working relationship is seriously impaired. Ultimately, the program can be adversely affected, as Amy and Wendy both suggested:

> I guess the fact that this was a three year pilot project and yet there was nothing in writing, although a proposal had been given to government. I think it would have helped people to move ahead if they had known that this would be a three year pilot project and this is the funding available. It would have made the offering of classes easier. (Amy 289-294)

> And they changed their mind, first they said it was part of the grant, then they said it was supposed to be a separate initiative. That to me was frustrating - I wondered if I was just stupid and had missed some information. Then I had to question whether LINGA had missed something, or whether they had heard something that I didn't. And then we just went through this confusion again, and I thought "we don't have a hearing problem, they're changing the rules." (Wendy 295-300)

Summary

The college administrators did not concern themselves with a definition for heritage language education until they realized that it affected funding for the program. The two administrators directly involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program determined that the political environment most influenced the development and implementation of the program, particularly in terms of financial resources. Five stakeholder groups were mentioned;

members of the program advisory committee, community-based organizations, the host educational institution, the government consultants, and the learners. The college administrators viewed the program advisory committee as somewhat effective, however, noted the need for some significant changes. It was recommended that membership on such committees should change in response to the resources required by a program at a given point in time. Further, that roles for advisory committee members should be clearly defined and that new strategies to manage power struggles and ensure accountability by all stakeholders should be explored. With the exception of the demand placed upon volunteer resources, it was concluded that LINGA gained much through their partnership in this initiative. In the opinion of the college administrators, the continuous change in government consultants made it impossible to communicate effectively. The administrators stressed the value of the learners providing information which shaped the curriculum and the format for course delivery.

According to the college administrators, successful aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program included opportunities for the learners to apply their knowledge, the cultural diversity of the student cohort, the flexibility demonstrated by the stakeholders in responding to changing needs, and the leadership skills developed by the learners. Three suggestions for improvement were a more stable base of financial resources, increased marketing of the program, and a firmly established schedule for courses. Two areas for future activity in support of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were identified by the instructors; the accreditation of the program and the preparation of a plan to prepare community-based heritage language instructors to offer the courses to their peers.

The administrators had the most to say about collaborative relationships in the community. The process factors which they considered to support collaboration included allowing for the articulation of the idea, celebration of success, clear communication, continuity in stakeholder representatives, and documentation about the project. In terms of relationship factors commitment, confidence, equality, passion, personal connections, reciprocity, respect, trust and sharing of success were mentioned. In addition, the administrators considered these resource factors to be conducive to collaboration; adequate funds and human resources, opportunities to reflect upon the work being done, and sufficient time to design and implement the program. The three structural factors matched those of other stakeholder groups; clearly defined roles, a common definition of ownership, and shared values. The factor which the college administrators concluded was most likely to interfere with collaboration was ineffective communication. Other factors which they mentioned included inaccurate needs assessment, intolerance of mistakes, contorting programs to meet requirements for funding, unclear expectations of partners, and unknown rules. The college administrators offered five aspects concerning relationships between stakeholders which they viewed as having negative consequences for working collaboratively; partners feeling taken advantage of by others, competition between partners, partnerships which are forced in order to gain resources, partnerships which are formalized on paper but not genuine, and partnerships where responsibilities are not equally shared.

Chapter 9

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

> Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, with each other. (Freire, 1987, p. 58)

This chapter is intended to provide findings and conclusions which relate to the specific research questions and the overall purpose of the study. The latter part of the chapter includes a discussion of areas of further research which could contribute to the central theme of the study.

Findings

The purpose of this study has been to examine the design and implementation of a community-based program in collaboration with several stakeholder groups. The chapter will commence with a discussion concerning outcomes and future directions for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Following a review of the factors which influenced program development and implementation, the findings of this research study will be reflected upon in relation to collaborative educational ventures.

Perceptions of Program Outcomes

All of the stakeholders mentioned two positive outcomes of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program; that the learners had opportunities to apply their learning to their practice, and they developed an appreciation of each other's culture. Both the instructors and the learners spoke of opportunities for the learners to share their new knowledge with other members of their ethnocultural communities; the level of support that the learners provided to each other; and, the increased sense of self-esteem, self-confidence, and empowerment experienced by the learners. The learners also reported improvement in their fluency in English, increased ease in communication, improved leadership skills, and an expanded knowledge of the education system in Canada (which enabled them to better appreciate the experiences of their children).

The DACUM process which was used to develop the curriculum, the curriculum syllabus, and the quality of instruction were also noted as positive outcomes by several stakeholder groups. From the perspective of the advisory committee members, the administrators, and the consultants, the Heritage Language Instructor Training program provided opportunities to recognize the value of heritage language education; to demonstrate government support for heritage language education; to work in partnership with stakeholder groups; and, to demonstrate belief in the future of heritage language education.

Several suggestions were made concerning aspects of the program which could be improved upon. The advisory committee members, administrators, and consultants all stressed the need to more actively market the program. Although the courses were advertised in the LINGA newsletter, Community College publications, and several ethnocultural newsletters, it was concluded that more promotion was required. As well, these three stakeholder groups and the learners recommended that, in future, the schedule of the courses be established for a two year period.

The learners and the instructors suggested that a student workbook should be developed. The learners expressed difficulty in understanding the theory which was presented in some of the courses, yet, the instructors suggested that more theory should be integrated into the curriculum. The instructors thought that providing the learners with a sound knowledge base would enable them to continue their study of the discipline.

Both the learners and the instructors spoke of the value of having the same instructor for several courses but also appreciated the variety of perspectives which could be presented by different instructors. Both groups agreed that instructors needed to be sensitive to the English literacy levels of the learners and, their lack of familiarity with educational strategies and technologies used in Canada. The instructors also suggested exploring alternative formats for course delivery; allowing more opportunities for the learners to provide feedback; reviewing the sequence in which the courses were offered; and recognizing the limited resources available to these heritage language instructors in their community-operated schools.

Future Directions for the Program

An analysis of the data provided by the stakeholders revealed three possible future activities in support of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program; accreditation of the program, preparation of community-based instructors, and offering the courses in a variety of locations. All of the stakeholders recommended the accreditation of the program, yet this term held different meanings for the respective groups. The advisory committee members, administrators, consultants, and instructors did not perceive value in securing approval for the curriculum as a credit one year certificate. Given their appreciation of the politics involved in pursuing this goal, and the limited probability of being successful, these stakeholders recommended that emphasis be placed upon securing recognition of these courses for advanced standing toward other post-secondary certificate, diploma, and degree programs. Those learners who were angry that their foreign teaching credentials were not recognized in Canada most wanted the accreditation of the program as a one year certificate. Should the Heritage Language Instructor Training program have been designed to meet the needs of these learners? Did a non-credit program only serve to further marginalize the learners and prevent the achievement of their career goals?

With the exception of one member of the program advisory committee, there was unanimous support for the development of a curriculum which would prepare other heritage language instructors to teach these courses. Support for this concept was based on recognition of the need to utilize local resources to reduce the cost of offering the program and to make it accessible to heritage language instructors in other geographic locations. The one dissenting stakeholder thought that the preparation of teachers should be the sole responsibility of universities. Did this lone voice represent a larger community? Will heritage language instructors enrol in courses taught by their peers?

The administrators supported the offering of the curriculum by means of brokerage agreements with other post-secondary institutions or community organizations as a future activity. One advisory committee member recommended the development of videotape materials to accompany the curriculum syllabus to facilitate the program being offered in other locations. Both of these initiatives require further financial resources. Who will bear these costs?

Influences on Program Development

The three stakeholder groups who proposed factors and/or situations which influenced the decision to develop the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were the members of the program advisory committee, the college administrators, and the government consultants. With the exception of one consultant and one advisory committee member, all agreed that the idea for the program initiated in the community and was presented by the executive of LINGA to the government consultants and Community College as a potential project. These two individuals considered themselves to be the creators of the program concept. Was sufficient attention paid to the ego needs of these two stakeholders? Would more recognition of the contributions of Joe and Ken have increased their commitment to the project?

During the period 1987 to 1989, when the program was being designed, the stakeholders recalled that the political climate was supportive of multicultural initiatives and heritage language education. The provincial government provided financial and policy support to programs which responded to the needs of a multicultural community. The federal government promoted an 'open-door' immigration policy and supported programs and services which facilitated the integration of immigrants into society. The members of the advisory committee also suggested that research in the area of heritage language education documented the need for preparation for those teaching these languages in the community.

Influences on Program Implementation

The program implementation phase of the project commenced in January, 1990 and continued through to September, 1992. All of the stakeholder groups described significant changes in the level of support for heritage language education and multicultural programs during this time period. From an economic perspective the decision by the federal government to discontinue financial support for the operation of community-based heritage language schools, a rise in the provincial level of unemployment, and a growing concern with the reduction of government spending, both provincially and nationally, adversely affected resources. The decline in the level of support provided by both levels of government for multicultural programs further diminished the amount of monies available to support the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

In terms of the influence of the political context upon program implementation, the learners and instructors observed a growing perception, by politicians and the public, that immigrants were taking jobs away from Canadians and abusing the social services system. This created a sense of discomfort with publicizing any activity which might be perceived as promoting cultural retention. The consultants stated that changing missions, mandates, and policies, within both the federal and provincial government departments responsible for multiculturalism, created confusion and resulted in delays in the approval of program proposals. By contrast, the members of the program advisory committee viewed this confusion as an asset suggesting that programs were supported in an effort to demonstrate political correctness, and some level of support for multiculturalism. In view of the political uncertainty concerning the value of multiculturalism, the consultants were disappointed that ethnocultural communities were reluctant to advocate for heritage language education by lobbying government.

All stakeholder groups noted an increased incidence of racism and discrimination in the province which caused the general public to question the value of immigration and gave credence to an assimilist view promoted by some politicians. The learners also surmised that the public was providing a clear statement of preference for a unilingual society.

Only two situations were identified as having supported the implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. The instructors and members of the program advisory committee suggested that, from a practical perspective, the presence of staff at Community College whose role was to work with the ethnocultural communities proved invaluable. As well, current research which supported the benefit of heritage language education provided support, in principle, for the initiative.

Program planners need to maintain a strong sense of the economic, political, and social contexts within which they are working. Throughout this study there was much evidence of the importance of advocacy skills and the ability to politicize community needs. Given the current paucity of programs designed to prepare skilled community educators and community developers, do we have practitioners with the necessary skills?

Continued financial support for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program relied heavily upon the advocacy skills and personal commitment of individuals, especially the government consultants. Who are the best advocates for such programs? What actions can positively affect the future of community-based programs?

The majority of community-based adult education programs continue to respond to the needs of underprivileged and marginalized populations and, as such, typically depend upon support from the public sector. This case study clearly revealed the potential influence of context upon program development and implementation, particularly when government resources are required to support the initiative. The option of offering these courses with program costs supported solely through tuition fees was untenable due to the limited incomes of the learners.

Working Collaboratively

Since the 1970s, researchers have been interested in the collaborative process in educational institutions, government, and non-profit organizations. In 1979, Houston cited the need for research which addressed the more complex aspects of collaboration such as the structure of collaborative ventures (organization, governance, management structure), communication problems within and between partner organizations, and support and reward systems for stakeholders. Today, despite a significant increase in research activity much of the literature is, as Houston (1979, p. 333) earlier commented, still "filled with case studies and observations...[describing] conditions, designs, and dreams." Recent works by Cervero and Wilson (1993) and Knox (1993) have provided critical reflection on the process of collaboration in the development and implementation of adult education programs. However, their conclusions, while sound in theory, lack the concrete perspective sought by the practitioner. This study provided a unique opportunity for the researcher to span the boundaries of research and practice and investigate this transition from theory to action.

Process of Partnership Leads to Programs

Partnerships represent such a fundamental concept it is surprising that they, and for that matter the community education process, have not been more widely recognized. The process aspect of community education is that which makes it unique in its ability to result not merely in programs responsive to the needs of stakeholders, but to also foster interagency collaboration and the empowerment of community members.

A logical first step in this process is the completion of a needs assessment to determine the interests, desires, and problems which the stakeholders wish to address through the development of a program. Needs assessment in community education is predicated on the belief that the community is the greatest source of expert knowledge, and that this wisdom can be tapped through the process of discussion, deliberation, and collaborative decision-making. It is not uncommon for this iterative process of determining need to take considerable time. In the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, it was two years before the stakeholders agreed which sector of the heritage language instructor population the resultant program would benefit.

Those pursuing collaborative projects need to be ever conscious of the value of process. As stakeholder groups press for action, we must be mindful of the peril of premature closure; programs which do not accurately reflect community needs ultimately prove ineffective. Thompson (1969) reminds us of the process of creativity and the need to allow time for ideas to coalesce:

> First, the creative process is an irregular one, and it often seems aimless and unpredictable. It is characterized by sudden leaps. From the point of view of production norms, it seems inefficient. It does not seem to be a disciplined, diligent, pay-attention-to-business sort of thing. Second, the creative process is characterized by slowness of commitment, by

> suspended judgment, by refusal to grasp opportunity, by refusal to make quick, decisive judgments. (p.10)

Do our organizational structures truly support program partnerships? Are we willing to financially support such extensive needs assessment projects? Who should bear these costs? When do we conclude the process?

Structure of Collaborative Ventures

Noticeably absent in the literature are descriptions of the organizational structures, policies, and management strategies which support collaborative educational ventures. Collaboration is distinct from cooperation in its requirement to alter the status quo of partner organizations by changing structures, policies, and practices (Melaville, 1993). Yet, current research provides virtually no descriptive evidence of these structural changes within partner organizations. To this end, the following discussion will address aspects of structure pertinent to the achievement of collaborative working relationships as experienced in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

Defining the Nature and Structure of Partnership

Recognizing that collaboration requires involvement and commitment, it is critical that the stakeholders agree concerning the nature of the partnership. A truly collaborative partnership is mutually beneficial to all and this requires determining the self-interests of the various parties. Typical self-interests may include the need for recognition, a sense of belonging, control of information, and the need to help others (Lueder and Hantel, 1986). In the case of the

Heritage Language Instructor Training program, initially, it appeared that the purpose of the partnership was to develop and implement a series of courses to prepare heritage language instructors. As the partners worked together to achieve this outcome, numerous self-interests emerged; Joe's desire for national profile for the program, Joan's need to ensure quality by teaching the courses, just to name a few. Given the number of stakeholders involved in this program, remaining current with the self-interests of all proved a mammoth task.

Sufficient attention is seldom directed towards determining the degree of the formality of collaborative relationships. If written agreements are developed, as in the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, such documents tend to address questions of copyright, payment schedules, timelines for completion of contracted services, and not vested interests of the stakeholders. Consideration should be given to the establishment of personal contracts with stakeholders to determine and document how their self-interests, and the interests of those whom they represent, can best be accommodated. These documents could then be reviewed and discussed regularly to determine any necessary changes.

Collaboration is by its very nature long term and requires intensive planning of administrative, personnel, and financial matters (Eyster, 1975). This statement presents a bitter irony when, in fact, most community-based adult education programs are provided funds on a term-specific basis, are staffed by volunteer personnel, and often experience considerable staff turnover. The development of a three year plan for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program provided an overall direction for the energies of the staff and the members of the program advisory committee. It proved ineffective, however, in securing funding on a continuing basis, nor did it have any influence on the continuous re-assignment of government consultants. Perhaps the inherent value in developing a formal plan for such activities is to provide a vision of the intents of the program and to secure the ongoing commitment of the stakeholders.

Importance of Stakeholders and Context

The story of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program clearly illustrated the influence of context and the consequences of fully engaging stakeholder groups in the process of community-based education. As well, it provided some perspective on the forces, factors, processes, and structures which influenced the way in which these stakeholder groups worked together.

With the exception of the learners, all considered the program advisory committee to be a significant stakeholder with reference to community education programs. A number of questions were raised concerning the appropriateness of the traditional role of such a committee. These included the limitations faced by members in actively contributing to the committee within the parameters of their official roles; the challenge of maintaining a level of momentum and morale among the membership; whether those directly involved in teaching in a program should be members of such a committee; and, whether a member of a stakeholder group can effectively chair such a committee. The college administrators were the most critical of the advisory committee model and suggested that such groups were highly politicized and no longer representative of the 'grass roots' perspective. They recommended increased flexibility in the appointment of members with the opportunity to alter membership in response to the evolution of the program.

Traditionally, community colleges have defined the role of advisory committee members as contributing political support, information, and in some cases, funds. However, in circumstances where advisory committee members are more actively involved in program planning and implementation they may view the resources as flowing to the project, not to the college, and being under their joint control. This may result in a lack of clarity concerning accountability and ownership (Valentine, 1984). Thus, ironically, the very same commitment by stakeholders which sustained the Heritage Language Instructor Training program could have been the cause of the confusion in relation to ownership of the program and areas of responsibility.

With the exception of the learners and the instructors, the other stakeholder groups mentioned the government consultants as a key stakeholder. These individuals were viewed as providers and receivers of information and the link between policies, programs, and resources. Critical to the accomplishment of effective communication was continuity in consultants assigned to the program and the development of rapport with all stakeholder groups. All stakeholders indicated that, in the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, neither of these goals was successfully achieved.

Government decision-makers may prove difficult to include in the collaborative process so there is a need to focus on inducements, appropriate forms of participation, and outcomes that they value (Knox, 1993). With respect to the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the government consultants stated that no prescribed role existed for them. Perhaps more comprehensive discussions with the consultants would have resulted in a stronger articulation of their roles and the program outcomes which they wanted to achieve. For the few consultants who appeared to lack a strong personal commitment to the project this opportunity might have more actively engaged their energies.

It is essential to recognize the diverse political realities of stakeholders and avoid becoming involved in the internal politics of partner organizations (De Bevoise, 1986). In this case study, the actions of Joe were perhaps the most suggestive of political behavior. However, other political conflicts were occurring within the provincial government department which employed the consultants, and among several executive members of LINGA. An awareness and appreciation of the political climates of the partners in the program was important, however, the more one learned in this regard, the greater the challenge to not become involved vicariously.

Success in community-based programming will depend upon the administrator's knowledge and understanding of the socio-cultural, economic, and political contexts in which the institution functions. In the words of one college administrator:

> Certainly when you are working in the area of community- based education, I think that context is absolutely critical...I think that when you are working in community-based education if you think about context as colour, you are not working in pastels, you are working in intense colours...Context is the cornerstone in terms of what we do, how we do it, who does it, how you think about the problem, et cetera. (Beth 60-62,73-75, 82-84)

Perhaps one of the most important lessons learned in conducting this research was the value of continuous monitoring of the environment. Are we as program planners willing to commit our resources to continuous monitoring of the environment? How do we utilize this information to our advantage? How entrenched do we become in the communities with which we work?

Identifying Responsibilities and Respective Roles

Certainly, the principle that more partners should provide more resources to complete the work has limitations in practice. Time and energy is required to negotiate what responsibilities the various stakeholders will assume. For partners to agree to this participatory role requires not only a contribution of time but also the containment of egos. As was the case with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, stakeholders appeared to experience relatively little difficulty in agreeing what needed to be done, the confusion occurred in relation to who would assume responsibility for the task.

Simultaneous with the development of a schedule for the development and implementation of this community-based program, a description of the responsibilities of the three partners in the program (Community College, government, and LINGA) was developed. This document was also presented at the inaugural meeting of the program advisory committee and was reviewed each time a request for funding for the project was developed. With the changes in staff within three of the partner organizations, this document served as a mechanism for clarifying respective areas of accountability. In retrospect, the researcher would advise that a more extensive statement of responsibilities be developed for each stakeholder group involved with the project and that these statements be signed by the representative of that group. This approach may have helped to clarify areas of responsibility for some of the stakeholders. However, many of the stakeholders were volunteers with limited resources which they could commit to the project. Is it reasonable to presume that all stakeholders will assume a level of accountability for the program?

Determining Realistic Expectations of Partnership

Knox (1987) determined that continued cooperation among stakeholders is dependent upon the achievement of a favorable cost/benefit ratio and that, at times, the benefits may have to be presented to the stakeholders. The administrators and consultants concurred with this perspective, stating that the concept of collaboration was still novel and largely misunderstood. Consequently, those providing leadership and support to collaborative ventures need to commit energy and time to reaffirming the value of such an approach.

The stakeholder groups stated that community organizations, such as LINGA, would experience benefits and costs through their involvement in community-based educational activities. The benefits for such organizations included, the provision of a focused task for the membership, a greater public profile which may result in increased membership, an opportunity to acquire resources, and a sense of ownership of the outcome. The greatest cost associated with such participation was the stress placed upon volunteer resources.

Collaborating organizations share funds, staff, and other resources. The rewards, or expected outcomes, must be worth the investment to each participant. Partners need to determine the level of resources which will be required to sustain a program through to completion and make solid commitments to provide these. Insufficient resources appear to be the primary cause of the failure of collaborative relationships (De Bevoise, 1986) and proactive resource planning may circumvent such an outcome. Substantial time is required to negotiate the interests of the stakeholders and to develop appropriate resource plans.

A critical element in determining the benefits and costs of collaborative programs is the assumption of risk. Moving beyond coordination to collaboration requires addressing the "terrible T's" (Cox, 1974) of tradition, trust and turf. The level of risk that stakeholders are willing to accept will clearly determine the extent to which these and other problems are overcome. This research would suggest that risk is not necessarily shared equally by all partners and that the "terrible T's" present a formidable challenge. Further investigation of ways to facilitate the sharing of risk among stakeholders would be valuable.

Establishing a Supportive Infrastructure

Collaboration starts with senior administrative support and the removal of bureaucratic impediments, the provision of resources and incentives, and the recognition of collaborative efforts (De Bevoise, 1986). Often, as was the case with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, collaborative programs occur on the margins of organizations and, as such, do not attract the attention of senior bureaucrats within the host organization.

An element critical to the success of collaborative community-based programs is time for the concept to be fully articulated. The program planner can act as a catalyst, initiating dialogue with the stakeholder groups and attaining consensus about what action should be taken to address the issue. Administrators and program planners must be cognizant of the limitations faced by some stakeholder groups in articulating the need that exists within the community. As one administrator cautioned, the process of dialogue is time-consuming and requires interpreting the needs expressed by the stakeholders:

> Well, you and I approach our work from an intellectual and a practical viewpoint simultaneously. Many community groups are not operating on those levels, in fact the majority are operating on either a very practical level or a very political level. Some operate on an intellectual level but very few are combining all of those

> viewpoints in their work so it's a lot of meetings, and one-on-ones and group sessions to get a perspective on where everyone is coming from in that organization. (Liz 14-22)

This process of articulation of the intents of the community-based initiative may be further stymied when the leaders are not representing the views of the stakeholder groups. As one administrator explained, "Often times what I find is that the few people at the top who have the vision are not supported by the people underneath them in the organization" (Liz 463-466).

It is critical that community college staff become knowledgeable about the cultures, programs, resources and organizations of these stakeholder groups in order to establish stronger linkages between the leaders (Boone, 1992). The extended period of time spent by the researcher, as a participant observer, provided ample opportunity for the development of an appreciation and understanding of the culture and practices of these stakeholder groups which proved invaluable, not only to her role as researcher but also in her work as the administrator of the program.

Several stakeholder groups suggested that in addition to the professional resources and infrastructure that educational institutions could provide to support such efforts, the credibility and stability of the institution (Knox, 1987) may encourage other organizations to provide financial support for such initiatives. The positive image of a quality educational institution may serve to attract expert instructors and financial resources, as well as positively affect enrolment rates.

Defining Ownership of Outcomes

The most important principle in successful collaborative programs is ownership (Green, 1976). Stakeholders will commit to projects where they truly feel a part of the outcome.

Much confusion existed concerning ownership of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Ownership was defined in the minds of the stakeholders and formally documented within the government funding contract. All of the stakeholders viewed the curriculum developer, Joan, as being very much an owner of the curriculum. Ironically, she did not express this same opinion. Legally, the provincial government claimed ownership of the curriculum syllabus.

Perhaps the greatest confusion with respect to ownership of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program existed among Community College staff. Traditionally, a community college would claim ownership of a program by virtue of developing the curriculum and offering the courses. This ownership was presumed to exist in perpetuity. Furthermore, monies earned through the brokering of the program to other institutions were considered the property of the originating institution.

This research clearly demonstrates the need to define and document, in collaboration with the stakeholders, the parameters of ownership. The value of continuously reviewing this understanding of ownership was also apparent. If programs are truly collaborative, ownership of the resultant curriculum will be shared. Educational institutions need to carefully examine their willingness to accept this situation.

Collaborative Leadership

When working with stakeholders external to the host agency for a program it is important that agency administrators are knowledgable about how the agency functions and provide effective leadership strategies for this context (Knox, 1982). Effective leaders need to pay careful attention to the structures and climates of the various stakeholder organizations. If organizational structures are incompatible, the operation of collaborative partnerships can be disrupted and efficiency lost (Beder, 1984). Knox (1993, p. 471) concluded that "leadership for planning entails gaining member commitment to shared vision, mission, and goals. Leadership for implementation of plans requires guiding member contributions so that goals and objectives are achieved."

Boone (1992) proposed that community college staff can provide valuable leadership to the stakeholder groups in developing, coordinating, and implementing the plan of action for community-based programming. The stakeholder groups were involved in virtually all aspects of the design and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Their involvement included the articulation of the idea, the development of the proposal for the program, the review of the competency profile developed through the DACUM process, participation on the program advisory committee, the identification of criteria for the selection of students and instructors, the recruitment of instructors, teaching in the program, the establishment of policies which affected the program, the review of the curriculum syllabus, and lobbying politicians to continue support for the program. The college staff provided the administrative and clerical support required to complete these tasks and assumed responsibility to ensure that the goals of the project were achieved.

As a stakeholder group, the college administrators expressed frustration when some stakeholder groups did not acknowledge the value of the leadership provided by college staff. As one administrator commented:

> In working with the community there is a lot of disagreement but I take the small successes when they come and enjoy them. The frustration is not getting very many small things. I find that doing community development work is often lonely. (Brian 196-199)

The stakeholders perceived that a continuing challenge for the educational institution was achieving a sufficient degree of control which facilitated collaboration while ensuring accountability. Knox (1993, p. 482) cautioned that "while enthusiastically promoting solidarity and cooperation among stakeholders, it is important for planners to avoid overcontrol, which discourages creativity and initiative."

Do our organizational structures encourage, support, and reward collaborative leadership styles? Or are collaborative leaders viewed merely as weak administrators? Can we support the continuity in leadership essential to the achievement of true collaboration?

De Bevoise (1986) suggested that trust allows for cooperating parties to share authority. The development of such trusting relationships requires multiple shared experiences, patience, nurturing, and personal commitment and are always at the peril of personalities. Are we as administrators and program planners willing to engage with stakeholders in such an intimate manner? The sharing of authority and the development of leadership skills among stakeholders is reflective of the community education process. Are we willing to assume such a risk as institutionally based administrators?

Communicative Challenges

The collaborative model involves sharing that is dependent upon continuous communication (Hord, 1986). Frequent interactions across all levels of partner organizations are essential.

Shared Language and Philosophy

Although all of the stakeholder groups were cognizant of the federal government definition of the term "heritage language education", they preferred to define this activity relative to their own context. The adoption of a contextually-based definition placed increased emphasis upon cultural retention. The administrators, advisory committee members, and consultants warned of the consequences of adopting a definition which was exclusive of 'mainstream' society. Rather, they recommended the use of more inclusive language which promoted heritage language education as a societal benefit. All stakeholders agreed that efforts should be directed towards establishing a common definition which would be acceptable to the various groups in the community.

It is imperative that the partners in community education programs allocate sufficient time to develop a shared understanding of the intents and outcomes of the program; to get to know one another (Rolzinski and Charner, 1987); and, to respect each other's differences (Padak, 1993). In the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the stakeholder groups held different meanings for a variety of terms, a situation that presented an ongoing need to dialogue and, in some circumstances, resolve conflict arising from these different perceptions.

Through the course of this study, the researcher recognized that an individual's personal philosophy of heritage language education influenced her/his expected outcomes for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. In retrospect, more time should have been directed towards reaching a common understanding among the stakeholders of the definition, philosophy and purpose of heritage language education in order that greater consensus concerning the outcomes of the program could be achieved.

All of the stakeholder groups viewed the affiliation of heritage language education and multicultural programs with some degree of reservation. The learners expressed the strongest concerns in light of their perception that the support of the general public for multicultural policies and programs was diminishing. The advisory committee members, administrators, consultants, and instructors thought this to be a logical partnership, however, they suggested that this alliance could be short-lived if public pressure resulted in the withdrawal of funds to support multicultural programs.

This case study research illustrated that the identification of heritage language education as a multicultural initiative served, for the most part, a purely pragmatic purpose: that of procuring funds to support the development and implementation of a program. As the data confirmed, the acquisition of resources is a primary reason to establish partnerships between stakeholder groups. Pressured by time and the need to garner financial support, stakeholder groups may be cursory in their efforts to reach consensus concerning the intent of their program and its 'fit' with the priorities of the funding organization (Valentine, 1984). Evidence of a willingness to develop a partnership (Fingeret, 1984) and the selection of partners for more than political support (Valentine, 1984) are important to achieving true collaboration.

Clear, Open Communication

The value of clear, effective, frequent communication (Beder, 1984; Knox, 1993; Padak, 1993), the provision of regular feedback including encouragement and recognition, and the utilization of informal communication networks (Forester, 1993) has been noted repeatedly with reference to collaborative program planning. In the case of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, the 1200 hours which the researcher spent with the stakeholders was vital to the success of the program. Despite this substantial commitment of time, both the stakeholders and the researcher recommended that at least twice as much time should have been committed to communicating with each other, both formally and informally. Some stakeholders recommended weekly conversations between Community College staff and the LINGA executive. The learners, instructors, and members of LINGA all commented that a greater proportion of time should be spent interacting socially with the various stakeholders and updating them concerning recent developments within the program.

Is it realistic to expect those involved in collaborative programs to interact so frequently? Who will bear the costs of the time to attend meetings and to communicate with stakeholders one-to-one? Working within a structure where one typically needs to recover the cost of one's salary, how is this achieved? Assuming that, over time, there will be transition in stakeholder representation and staff, can such an ideal communicative relationship be established or maintained?

Flynn (1991) advised that through the process of networking skills, knowledge and activity can be shared through a social or educational process. Viewing stakeholders in the community as a network reminds us of the interactive nature of the social network on a larger scale (Emery and Trist, 1972). McClelland (1937) recognized the value of personal networks through which flow knowledge, skills and attitudes. These same networks can assist with identifying sources of resources, personal influence, and group norms.

Considerable time was spent by the college administrators verifying information concerning the political context with key informants in the community. These key informants also served as messengers to convey information to politicians, in situations where it would be inappropriate for a college administrator to do so. This reliance upon community leaders to communicate concerns was an approach which traditionally had been employed by senior officers of the college, not front-line administrators. This communicative approach required trust that the stakeholders would communicate information through the contacts they had within the political community.

Much emphasis was placed upon the value of clear, effective oral communication by the stakeholders. Members of the program advisory committee also stressed the need for clear, concise written communication. Given changes in personnel involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, documentation of the process of program development and program implementation, and proposed outcomes proved invaluable. In retrospect, this documentation should have been more extensive and more widely distributed to the stakeholders.

Conflict Management

Fallon and Kowalski (1986) viewed conflict as a constant in the community education process and considered it to be an effective catalyst for change. Conflict was experienced early in the program planning process with respect to the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. Immigrants who wished to have their foreign teaching credentials recognized for employment in

Canada argued their case relentlessly. This heated debate required 18 months to reach a point of resolution. There was also considerable difference of opinion, among the membership of LINGA, concerning whether resources should be directed to support the professional development of members who had not been formally educated as teachers.

In studying the collaborative process, Rolzinski and Charner (1987, p.76) found that "intangible and unforseen conflicts involving questions of tradition, orientation, points of view, culture, responsibility, attitudes, and mission were identified as some of the most serious, complex, and sometimes insurmountable problems, especially in the planning and early implementation stages." During this time, the Community College staff donated their time to assist LINGA in determining what the focus of the program would be. For both Joe and Wendy, this decision caused their supervisors to question when the organization would achieve measurable benefits, or more exactly, financial support for this initiative,

When organizations engage in collaborative initiatives more conflict will be experienced (Simerly, 1987; Thompson, 1969). Acceptance of conflict should be a natural part of the process (Padak, 1993). As Sarason (1982) noted politics, personalities, and financial difficulties can quickly undermine a successful collaborative venture. The stakeholders commended Community College staff for effectively managing conflict over the six year period. Both college administrators thought that they should have addressed conflict management more proactively. When individuals started to engage in personal attacks on each other, the administrators removed themselves from the situation.

Are we willing as community educators, program planners, and administrators, to actively engage in conflict resolution? Where do our personal opinions and values fit within a collaborative framework for program planning and implementation? How do we manage our own negative feelings toward other stakeholders?

Trust and Respect

Murk (1988) suggested that community educators must understand and promote trusting relationships between individuals, and within and among groups in order to support collaboration. Collaborative relationships are characterized by a high level of trust and respect (Beder, 1984; Forester, 1989; Padak, 1993). All of the stakeholders involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program commented concerning the value of trust in working collaboratively. A first step in establishing trusting relationships with stakeholders in the community is to listen openly to what they have to say. Ensuring that stakeholders sense an equal status among others is also important (Padak, 1993) and can be supported through attentive listening.

While program planners may understand that each local situation is a unique combination of resources, needs, awareness, and limitations, they may not realize that the only people who truly know what these factors are are the stakeholders. As stakeholders begin to work in an accepting environment where they are respected and trusted, more open communication will occur. To attain this goal requires that we support needs assessment activities which do not have pre-determined program assumptions, and enable stakeholders to make decisions. Are we as professionals prepared to assume such a risk? Do we trust the stakeholders, the community education process, or for that matter, ourselves?

Support and Reward System

Working collaboratively is about people working with people. Consideration needs to be given to support and reward systems for the individuals involved in this group effort.

Caring, Commitment, and Consciousness

In truly collaborative working relationships, stakeholders exhibit caring for others, commitment to working with others, and a consciousness of their actions and motives toward other stakeholders (Appley and Winder, 1977). Caring and commitment were themes mentioned by all of the stakeholders in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. There was considerable recognition of the challenges and stresses encountered by various stakeholders over time. Stakeholders relentlessly accommodated the needs of others, particularly with respect to resources required to complete tasks. Many times a sympathetic ear, or a shoulder to lean on was provided.

The community educator can turn ideas into realities by focusing on informed commitment (Clark, 1987). If people are committed to the ideas lying beneath the actions, they will have the capacity to act (Smith, 1993) and will direct their efforts toward goal achievement because of shared goals, clear communication (Beckhard and Pritchard, 1992), and active involvement (Intriligator, 1986). With a rare exception, all of the stakeholders demonstrated a strong commitment to the success of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program. People went beyond the parameters of their professional responsibilities to ensure that resources to support the program were secured. During the initial stages of program planning and implementation, members of the program advisory committee donated considerable time to complete tasks in support of the program.

Program planners and administrators face an ongoing challenge in retaining the commitment of stakeholders in collaborative programs. Stakeholder commitment tends to decrease over time as individuals assume new responsibilities. Perhaps, as some suggested, there should be a planned transition for stakeholder involvement, particularly within formal structures such as program advisory committees. Commitment to collaborative programs may be more resilient if accountability is delimited in both duration and scope. As professionals, we must also reflect on our own level of caring and commitment towards the collaborative initiative and be exceedingly honest in defining our personal limits for involvement. Given the passion which some stakeholders may bring to their work, it may appear that our commitment is substantially less than theirs and this perception needs to be openly discussed and debated.

Celebration and Recognition

Especially when working with multiple stakeholder groups "who have limited experience working together, special attention must be addressed to their commitment, development, and recognition" (Knox, 1993, p. 491). The success of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was highly dependent upon the efforts of volunteers. The stakeholders, without exception, commended Community College on their efforts to celebrate and recognize the accomplishments of the learners, the success of the program, and the contributions of the volunteers. Much has been written in the volunteer management literature concerning appropriate recognition of effort. For those involved with the Heritage Language Instructor Training program, achievements were marked by social activities which included food. The development of the tradition of the pot-luck meal at the conclusion of each course established the tone for more formal celebrations such as graduation ceremonies. The stakeholders perceived the sharing of food, which they had prepared, as sharing of themselves. In order to be accepted as part of the celebratory group, one had to contribute to the fare. Participation by Community College staff in these activities did much to develop and sustain trust among the stakeholders. For some, this extension of one's professional responsibilities to the social realm may prove discomforting.

Flexibility

Simerly (1987) commented that the ambiguity, complexity, diversity and decentralization created through collaboration necessitates flexibility. The Heritage Language Instructor Training program was affected by continuing change during the design and implementation phases. Considerable flexibility was required by the stakeholders to respond to these changes. This willingness to change in response to emerging conditions enabled the program to survive through periods of uncertainty concerning support for this initiative. Program plans were modified to match with available resources.

The need to deal with ambiguity, complexity, change and diversity characterizes community education activities. Program planners and administrators must deal with the stress created by this requirement for flexibility. As the number of partners involved in program planning and implementation increases, so does the level of complexity and propensity for change.

Not Everyone is Born To Be a Collaborator

Those practitioners with rigid agendas, a distrust of theory, and a resistance to change (De Bevoise,1986) will experience great frustration in initiating or sustaining a collaborative program. Collaboration is dependent upon a community of believers in which enthusiasm, flexibility, and a shared language is evident.

True collaborators demonstrate mutual respect for their partners and value personal relationships. These interpersonal relationships which are essential to collaboration are fragile and require ongoing attention (Rolzinski and Charner, 1987). The establishment of a broad base of relationships between the stakeholders with multiple opportunities for social as well as professional interaction will prove beneficial (Fingeret, 1984) and will allow these interpersonal relationships to flourish.

Knox (1993, p. 477) concluded that the crucial contribution of "an enthusiastic process champion who generates support and persistence" will sustain collaborative relationships during even the most challenging times. This individual needs to have a sense of direction, persuasion, and perseverance to adopt strategies that encourage the expansion of human potential. A collaborative leader can best be described as someone exhibiting 'pushy diplomacy' (Walker, 1979) who maintains, at all times, a simple patience for others.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were based on the findings of the study and their subsequent analysis.

1. The development of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was a gradual process in which individuals interpreted and responded to the tasks on the basis of their personal beliefs and interests and, the implications for the stakeholder group which they represented.

2. The government consultants and the college administration had the power to dictate the direction of the program, however, to do so would have lost the support of the community and may have adversely affected

participation in the program.

3. The commitment and support of the administration of an educational institution involved with a community-based program is essential in creating an atmosphere conducive to collaboration among stakeholder groups. Support in principle as well as the development of an appropriate infrastructure is essential.

4. The most significant obstacle to the successful design and implementation of community-based programs is the absence of accurate, timely information concerning the goals and objectives of the program, the responsibilities of the stakeholder groups, and the resources available to support the initiative. Those directly involved in the design and implementation of such programs must have open communication established with those who design and implement policies which will affect the program.

Implications for Future Community-Based Programs

The following statements are based on the findings of the study and offer suggestions for the future design and implementation of community-based programs.

1. In developing plans for community-based programs, it is important that educational institutions anticipate and accommodate potential obstacles

to the implementation process. These obstacles can best be determined through continuous dialogue with stakeholder groups and key informants in the community. The challenge for the program planner is one of "connecting the voices" to get a true sense of the issues and concerns which will arise as a matter of course.

2. As this research study suggests, the key element in the development and maintenance of collaborative working relationships is caring, committed leadership. The stakeholder groups will react both intellectually and emotionally to situations which transpire. It is essential that program planners are able to identify these responses and to actively address the reactions of the individuals involved. This requires a commitment of time and energy that may well exceed the dimensions of one's professional responsibilities.

3. Resources tend to be inordinately "front end loaded" in such community-based programs. It is important that the equivalent energy, funds, and time committed to the development phase of a program be maintained throughout the implementation phase. This level of commitment can be maintained if there is frequent communication with the stakeholders, both formally and informally. The adverse reaction of one stakeholder to not feeling fully apprised of what is occurring can place a

4. It is important to establish partnerships with stakeholders based on personal connections, open communication, respect and trust. The ability to demonstrate flexibility in response to varied stakeholder needs, recognize different cultures, accommodate multiple styles of working, allow time for articulation of ideas, and tolerate conflict and error is essential to success in collaborative initiatves.

5. In the absence of a guarantee of continuity of stakeholders throughout the program planning and implementation process, developing clear and comprehensive documentation such as terms of reference, contracts, and role statements will prove beneficial. As well the development of a supportive infrastructure, quality leadership, and measures of accountability will improve program outcomes.

6. In planning and implementing collaborative programs, it is important to recognize achievement, and to celebrate success.

Implications for Research and Theory

The following implications for further research and theory development are based on the insights gained through the process of conducting this study and the analysis of the research findings.

Areas for Future Research

1. To further define factors which facilitate collaboration in designing and

implementing programs responsive to community needs based on other contents.

2. To identify the knowledge, skills and attitudes required by program planners to facilitate collaboration with stakeholder groups in the design and implementation of programs and a way to convey these to practitioners in the field.

3. To conduct further socio-cultural research of collaborative partnerships from the perspectives of the participants.

Areas for Theory Development

1. The development of a framework which will guide the process of collaboratively developing and implementing community-based programs.

Chapter 10

INFLUENCE OF RESEARCH ON RESEARCHER

An interview with two of the graduates of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was winding down. As I frantically scribbled key words across a piece of paper, there was lull in the conversation. I raised my head to determine what was happening. Maria looked calmly into my eyes and in a quiet, confident voice said,

> Now I have a question for you that I have always wanted to ask. What made you, an Anglo Saxon, be interested and care? I'm asking you this question because I trust you; if I didn't I would **never** ask this question. (Maria 359-361)

My mind went blank. The two women waited in silence for my answer. I realized that I must respond to the question - to fail to do so would break the bond of trust. From somewhere inside of me the words came tumbling out:

> Why I got involved with the program was because six years ago LINGA approached Joe about their need for a program for heritage language instructors. Joe asked me to meet with LINGA members and himself because of my involvement with English as a Second Language and multicultural programs at the college...I went to this meeting and the people that I remember the most were Mary and Sylvia, two women who had taught their heritage languages for more than 20 years. I remember thinking that if these people care that much about heritage language then maybe I can care that much too. (Wendy 362-372)

I was not impressed with my response to the question - it sounded so pragmatic and trite. As if she sensed my need to further explore my thoughts, Maria continued to probe:

> I asked you this question because when I meet people who support multiculturalism and heritage languages they have an ethnic background other than Anglo. I think that your knowledge of other cultures is very important. So many people in power do not have this. (Maria 399-402)

The word 'power' reverberated in my ears. I had never felt so powerless in 13 years of work in the field of community education. The development and implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was a story punctuated by numerous errors of commission and omission.

So why had I persisted with my multiple roles as administrator, instructor, and researcher? I smiled as I remembered the faces of the caring and committed people I had worked with over the past six years. Quietly, I answered, "As a group of people you captured my heart" (Wendy 393).

Defining the Research Question

The preparation of my research proposal was a two year long evolutionary process. The focus for the research changed considerably over this period of time. Through reading and discussion with colleagues I was exposed to new perspectives, each of which enriched my understanding of the research question. As I attempted to refine the proposal, incorporating this new learning, I experienced a sense of confusion. Gradually it became apparent that the study could be conducted from any of several perspectives; I merely had to select one.

I spent four months revising the research proposal. Try as I might, I could not seem to clearly define the purpose of the research. In desperation, I approached one of my committee members for assistance. Upon reading the most recent version of the proposal, she described it as "a technically sound piece of writing, devoid of personality." We spent the next hour discussing my research, a conversation punctuated by my recording of key words, concepts, themes, and other thoughts. The resultant research proposal, which was accepted for candidacy, was created in four hours.

I share this experience for the benefit of those who choose to conduct a longitudinal case study. The magnitude of the activity is such that it is easy to become lost in the research question. As researchers we are deceived concerning the complexity of such an undertaking by documents in which "through highly standardized report practices, scientists inadvertently hide from view the real inner drama of their work, with its intuitive base, its halting time-line, and its extensive recycling of concepts and perspectives" (Bargar and Duncan, 1982, p. 2).

Emerging Uncertainty

Those who choose to conduct case study research will never lack for data. As the months passed, I filled boxes with neatly labelled file folders containing interview transcripts and relevant documents. My personal journal expanded from one binder to several. It was strangely comforting to watch the data grow at an exponential rate. The quantity of data somehow reassured me of the validity and worthiness of my research, especially at those times when I shared my thoughts with friends and colleagues who failed to appreciate the significance of the work.

As I discussed my research topic with others I learned that many thought my commitment to the teaching of heritage language education was "un-Canadian". The first few times that I encountered this response, I was mildly shocked by the suggestion that immigrants should not be encouraged to retain their culture and heritage language. As I continued to encounter resistance to my thinking, I grew increasingly angry. As a result I started to avoid discussing my research and, when pressed, described it in a very succinct, abstract manner.

Stating My Values

The recognition of my emotional reaction to the response of others to my research caused me to question my objectivity. In response, I decided to clarify the values which I held concerning my research. I placed a copy of this statement of personal values inside the cover of my journal, next to my computer at home, and on my desk at the college. The statement, prepared on July 7, 1991, read as follows:

1. I believe that the maintenance of one's cultural heritage is important.
2. I support a culturally diverse Canadian society.
3. I believe that some aspects of education are best provided by community-based educators.

4. I believe that community-based educators should have access to pedagogical/andragogical training.
5. I believe that working collaboratively creates programs which are more responsive to community needs.
6. I believe that people are willing to balance their own self-interests with those of others.

During the data collection, data analysis, and writing phases of the research, I reviewed these statements to assist in "bracketing" (Dorbbert, 1984) my values so as to not skew the interpretation of the comments of others.

Clarifying My Feelings

On several occasions, I experienced strong emotional reactions to situations which transpired. When the federal government cut the operating grants for community-based heritage language schools, and later did not honor a commitment to the Canadian Heritage Language Institute, I mirrored the anger of the heritage language instructors. Subsequent comments by provincial politicians, which were critical of immigrants and denounced the value of their cultural heritage, further incensed me.

Given my level of interaction with the stakeholder groups, it was at times challenging to not be influenced by their emotions. Activities which enabled me to regain my sense of objectivity were recording my thoughts in a personal journal and accessing the attentive ear of my critical friend, who helped me to place my reactions in perspective.

In conducting qualitative research it is imperative that the researcher establish mechanisms and networks which provide a supportive environment to discuss the challenges encountered throughout the research process. This process of communicating the data, which I described in Chapter 1, proved invaluable in both the short and long term.

Coping with Change

Marshall and Rossman (1989, p. 21) cautioned that "real research is often confusing, messy, intensely frustrating, and fundamentally non-linear." In the case of my research, no truer words were ever spoken. The changes which took place in the environment significantly affected the direction of the study. Stakeholders emerged and retired, the perspectives of the stakeholders altered in response to changes in the environment, and the schedule for data collection fluctuated in response to the environment and the personal circumstances of the stakeholders and the researcher.

Listening to the Voices

The decision to personally transcribe the audio-taped interviews facilitated data analysis. Not only was I very familiar with the text of the transcripts, in reading these documents I could hear the voices of the interviewees. This opportunity to hear the interview tapes "playing in my head" hastened the process of identifying themes. During the data analysis and writing phases, portions of the interview tapes would invade my thinking and would result in a thought which I would record as quickly as possible, in consideration of the activity I was engaged in at the time.

On numerous occasions, I was prepared to abandon the research. I was overwhelmed by the volume of the data, uncertain about how to appropriately report the data, and concerned whether the research would provide information to improve practice (Hammond, 1989). One evening, I packed all the interview transcripts into a box and placed it in a dark corner in the basement of my house. The next morning, I received a telephone call from one of the learners who shared her success in locating a facility for her heritage language classes. That evening I retrieved the box and returned it to its former position on the floor of my office. I realized that to not complete my dissertation was to silence her voice.

Waning Self-Confidence

The data analysis and writing phases served to test my self-confidence. There were days when I was excited by the emergence of a theme in the data, convinced that I had discovered something significant. I would write feverishly for a period of several hours, fuelled by my conviction that the world wanted to share this learning with me. Then, as a candle flame flickers in the breeze, I would be consumed with self-doubt. I would put away my writing and wish that I had undertaken a quantitative study. When I gathered sufficient courage to read my work I was surprised by the quality of the writing and once again would apply myself to the task. For an individual known for her perseverance and self-discipline such procrastination was uncharacteristic and, at times, frightening.

As I was completing the first draft of the dissertation, I reviewed the writings of Strauss and Corbin (1990) and discovered two passages which suggested that my waning self-confidence was a common experience for those conducting qualitative research:

> But the issue here is not whether the analysis has been adequately and sufficiently done, but confidence that one really knows the answers to those questions. Even experienced researchers may not always be certain before they have chewed on their suspended pencils long enough to know where precisely are the holes - or to be certain that, after review, they know there are not important holes - in their analysis...Nevertheless, when approaching or even during the writing period, there is almost invariably a considerable amount of anxiety about whether this can be, or is being, accomplished effectively. After all, some people are perfectionists and cannot seem to settle for less than an ideal performance. That can mean, of course, no performance at all or a greatly delayed one. Others lack some measure of confidence in themselves generally, and this spills over into questions about ability to accomplish this particular kind of task. (pp. 259-260)

The Power of Hope

On January 24, 1994 I attended a meeting to discuss a five year proposal to develop an in-service program for heritage and second language teachers working in the schools and in the community. This project will mark the first collaborative venture between the local university and Community College in the area of teacher education. It will provide an opportunity for certificated and non-certificated teachers to learn together; enabling the graduates of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program to participate in university level classes without passing the TOEFL requirement. The dream that community-based heritage language instructors would be able to pursue their studies within the university context is about to become a reality.

For me this collaborative venture in community education has become more than a research study - it is a story of the power of hope. The words of Roger Simon (1992) capture the essence of hope which sustained the Heritage Language Instructor Training program and this research study through numerous challenges.

> Hope is the acknowledgement of more openness in a situation than the situation easily reveals; openness to all the possibilities of human attachments, expressions, and assertions. The hopeful person does not merely envisage this possibility as a wish; the hopeful person acts upon it now by loosening and refusing the hold that taken-for-granted realities and routines have over imagination. (p. 3)

My greatest learning over the past six years has been what can be achieved when stakeholder groups work collaboratively toward the achievement of a common goal, refusing to abandon their sense of hope. I have been very fortunate to have labored with so many people whose personal commitment made the dream of a program to prepare community-based heritage language instructors come true.

Chapter 11

EPILOGUE

Since February, 1994 the implementation of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program has continued to provide, for the stakeholders, both a sense of achievement and frustration. The train-the-trainers curriculum, comprised of four courses was offered from March to June, 1993. Ten of the graduates enroled in these classes and five completed all of the courses. Of those learners who withdrew from the courses, two found that the transportation time to the classes was too great, two experienced medical problems, and one could not arrange her work schedule to accommodate the class schedule. In June, a graduation ceremony was held for the five learners who completed the train-the-trainers courses as well as the second cohort of 16 heritage language instructors who successfully completed the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

In September 1994, 10 learners enroled in the train-the-trainers courses. Due to limited financial resources, courses in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program were not offered this fall. It is anticipated that these classes will be available again in January 1995. Graduates of the train-the-trainers program will teach some modules in these courses.

The revised curriculum syllabus for the Heritage Language Instructor Training program was to be completed by March, 1994. Due to conflicting demands for her time, Joan was unable to prepare these materials until April.

LINGA owed Community College monies for services provided during the period July 1, 1993 to June, 30 1994. The LINGA board members had invested their government grant monies in a term deposit which could not be cashed until after July 1, 1994. Consequently, by the time LINGA was able to release these monies to Community College, the provincial auditor had refused further expenditures for this project. Finally, at the end of October, Wendy was granted permission to expend monies to complete the revisions to the curriculum syllabus.

Discussions with TINGA concerning the offering of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program in their region of the province continue. In late October, the TINGA executive met for the first time with a local college to discuss the idea of brokering these courses. It was anticipated that these courses would be offered during the Fall of 1994, however, due to a change in staff and board members at TINGA this plan has not been realized.

Janet, Joan and Wendy have experienced great difficulty in finding time to meet with each other. Pam, the government consultant, has been very understanding of the factors which resulted in the continued delay of the completion of this project and is willing to extend the final date to December 31, 1994.

The commitment of all the stakeholders remains strong, however, all recognize that limited resources, particularly finances and time, continue to have adverse effects upon the program. Discussions are being held among the stakeholders to review the level of resources which can be allocated to the project and to determine future roles and responsibilities of the various partners.

Bibliography

Allen, G., & Martin, I. (1992). Education and community: The politics of practice. New York: Cassell.

Allen, G., Bastiani, J., Martin, I. & Richards, K., (Eds.). (1987). Community education - an agenda for educational reform. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Educational Enterprises.

Appley, D.G., & Winder, A.E. (1977). An evolving definition of collaboration and some implications for the world of work. Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 13 (3).

Argyris, C., & Schon, D.A. (1974). Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Astroth, K. (1992). More than good intentions: A developmental model for building strategic alliances. Community Education Journal, XXI, 9-12.

Baron, S. (1988). Community and the limits of social democracy: Scenes from the politics. In G. Green & S.J. Ball (Eds.), Progress and inequality in comprehensive education. London: Routledge.

Beckhard, R., & Pritchard, W. (1992). Changing the essence: The art of creating and leading fundamental change in organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Beder, H. (1987). Collaboration as a competitive strategy. New Directions for Continuing Education, 35, 90-95.

Beder, H. (1984). Principles of successful collaboration. New Directions for Continuing Education, 35, 85-90.

Beder, H. (1984a). Interorganizational cooperation: Why and how? New Directions for Continuing Education, 23, 3-22.

Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. (1985). Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life. New York: Harper and Row.

Bennett, C., Kidd, J.R., & Kulich, J. (1975). Comparative studies in adult education: An anthology. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education.

Biddle, W., & Biddle, L.J. (1965). The community development process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Boone, E.J. (1992). Community-based programming: An opportunity and an imperative for the community college. Community College Review, 20 (3), 8-21.

Boshier, R.W. (1971). Motivational orientations of adult education participants: A factor analytic exploration of Houle's typology. Adult Education, 21 (2), 3-26.

Brewer, I., & Hunter, A. (1989). Multimethod research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Briscoe, D.B. (1990). Community education: A culturally responsive approach to learning. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 48, 81-90.

Brookfield, S. (1986). Understanding and facilitating adult learning: A comprehensive analysis of principles and effective practices. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. (1983). Adult learners, adult education and the community. New York: Teachers College Press.

Brookfield, S. (1983a). Community adult education: A conceptual analysis. Adult Education Quarterly, 33 (3), 154-160.

Bryant, L. (1989). Today's communities: Getting to know you. Community Education Journal, 16 (4), 4-5.

Caplan, J. (1988). Public school and private university collaboration: A process for effecting change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

Cervero, R.M., & Wilson, A.L. (1994). Planning responsibly for adult education: A guide to negotiating power and interests. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cervero, R.M. (1984). Collaboration in university continuing professional education. New Directions for Continuing Education, 23, 23-38.

Cervero, R.M., & Wilson, A.L. (1992). Power and responsibility in planning adult education programs. Proceedings of the Adult Education Research Conference. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: University of Saskatchewan, .

Churchman, C.W. (1961) Prediction and optimal decision: Philosophical issues of a source of values. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Clark, P. (1987). The concept of community education. In G. Allen, J. Bastiani, I. Martin, & K. Richards (Eds.), Community education: An agenda for educational reform (pp. 50-69). Milton Keynes, England: Open University Educational Enterprises.

Cook, D.L., & Cookingham, F.G. (1980). Interagency action: Cooperation, coordination, collaboration. Community Education Journal, VII (2), 3-4.

Cox, J.C. (1974). Interagency collaboration and cooperation: A minimiziing of the terrible T's. Unpublished manuscript, Gaulladet College.

De Bevoise, W. (1986). Collaboration: Some principles of bridgework. Educational Leadership, 43 (5), 9 - 12.

DelPizzo, M. (1990). A naturalistic study of the salient themes of a school/business partnership. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.

Denzin, N.K. (1978). The research act (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill

Dobbert, M.L. (1982). Ethnographic research: Theory and application for modern societies and schools. New York: Praeger.

Edelson, P.J. (1992). Leadership and the future of adult and continuing education. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 56, 5-16.

Emery, F.E., & Trist, E.L. (1972). The causal texture of organizational environments. In M.B. Brinkeroff & P.R. Kuntz (Eds.), Complex organizations and their environments (pp.268 - 281). Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Eysler, G.W. (1975). Interagency collaboration: The keystone to community education. Community Education Journal, 5 (5), 24-26, 33.

Fingeret, A. (1984). Who's in control? A case study of university-industry collaboration. New Directions for Continuing Education, 23, 39-64.

Flannery, D., & Wiselock, R. (1991). Why we do what we do: Our working philosophy of adult education. Adult Learning, June, 7-8.

Fletcher, C. (1987). The meanings of community in community education. In G. Allen, J. Bastiani, I. Martin, & K. Richards (Eds.), Community education: An agenda for educational reform (pp. 50-69). Milton Keynes, England: Open University Educational Entreprises.

Flynn, P. (1992). Networking: Tactics of survival. In G. Allen & I. Martin (Eds.), Education and community: The politics of practice (pp. 94-102). New York: Cassell.

Forest, L.B. (1981). Goals should be set locally. In B.W. Kreitlow & Associates (Eds.), Examining controversies in adult education (pp. 186-195). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Forest, L.B. (1984). Using value types to identify need. Journal of Extension, 15, 24-34.

Forester, J. (1993). Critical theory, public policy and planning practice. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Forester, J. (1989). Planning in the face of power. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Fox, M.F., & Faver, C.P. (1984). Independence and cooperation in research: The movitations and costs of collaboration. Journal of Higher Education, 55 (3).

Freire, P. (1987). Reading the word and the world. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Freire, P. (1971). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Basic Books.

Galbraith, M.W. (1990). The nature of community and adult education. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 47, 3-11.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books

Gollattscheck, J.F. (1983). Strategic elements of external relationships. New Directions for Community Colleges, 44, 21-36.

Gollattscheck, J.F. (1981). Improving the health of the body politic. A Look to the Future Years: Projects Regarding the Scope and Process of Community Education. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Goodson, I.F. (1991). Studying curriculum: A social constructionist perspective. In I.F. Goodson and R. Walker (Eds.), Biography, identity and schooling: Episodes in educational research. London, EN: Falmer Press.

Griffith, W.S. (1978). Educational needs: Definition, assessment and utilization. School Review, 86 (3), 382-394.

Green, L. (1976). Process before program: A recipe for community involvement. Community Education Journal, V (3), 45-46.

Grobe, T. (1990). Synthesis of existing knowledge and practice in the field of educational partnerships. Waltham, MA: The Center for Human Resources.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1981). Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Habbermas, J. (1971). Knowledge and human interest. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

Hammond, L.D. (1989). Instructional policy into practice: "The power of bottom over the top". Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12 (3), 331-338.

Hiemstra, R. (1972). The educative community. Lincoln, NE: Professional Educators Publications.

Hord, S.M. (1986). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration. Educational Leadership, 43 (5), 22-26.

Houle, C.O. (1961). The inquiring mind. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Houston, W.R. (1979). Collaboration - see treason. In G.E. Hall, S.M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring Issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin, TX: University of Texas.

Intriligator, B. (1986, April). Collaborating with the schools: A strategy for school improvement. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.

Jick, T.D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 602-611.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). (2nd ed.). Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Knox, A.B. (1993). Strengthening adult and continuing education: A global perspective on synergistic leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Knox, A.B. (1989). Designing comprehensive programs in adult and continuing education. New Directions for Continuing Education, 44, 47-54.

Knox, A.B. (1982). External relations. New Directions for Continuing Education, 13, 85-102.

Knox, A.B. (1982a) (Ed.). Leadership strategies for meeting new challenges. New Directions for Continuing Education, 13. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass.

Knox, A.B. (1982b). Organizational dynamics in university continuing professional education. Adult Education, 32 (3), 117-129.

Knox, A.B. (1979). Administrators. New Directions for Continuing Education, 1, 23-49.

Kowalski, T.J. (1993). Community education in the 21st century: Phoenix or dinosaur? Community Education Journal, XX (3), 4-6.

Kowalski, T.J. (1987). The second coming of community education. The Education Digest, 51-54.

Kowalski, T.J., & Fallon, J.A. (1986). Community education: Processes and programs. Fastback 243. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation.

Laumann, E.O., Galaskiewicz, J., & Marsen, P.V. (1978). Community structure as organizational linkages. Annual Review of Sociology, 4, 455-484.

Levine, R.A., & White, M.I. (1986). Human conditions: The cultural bases of educational development. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Lueder, D.C., & Hantel, E.G. (1986). School-community partnership: What motivates the partners? Community Education Journal, XIII (3), 6-8.

Maier, N.R.F. (1963). Problem solving discussions and conferences: Leadership skills and methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Martin, I. (1987). Community Education: Towards a theoretical analysis. In G. Allen, J. Bastiani, I. Martin, & K. Richards (Eds.), Community education: An agenda for educational reform (pp. 9-32). Milton Keynes, England: Open University Educational Entreprises.

Mawhinney, H.B. (1993, April). Discovering shared values: A Canadian perspective on developing interagency collaboration. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Meeting. Atlanta, GA.

McCall, G.J., & Simmons, J.L. (1969). Issues in participant observation. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

McClelland, A. (1987). The educational community: A network perspective. Community Education Journal, XIV (2), 19-22.

Melaville, A.I. (1993). Together we can: A guide for crafting a pro-family system. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Merriam, S.B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S.B. (1982). Some thoughts on the relationship between theory and practice. In S.B. Merriam (Ed.) Linking philosophy and practice. New Directions for Continuing Education, 15, 87-92.

McKenzie, R.A. (1991). The time trap. New York: AMACOM

Mitroff, I.I. (1983). Stakeholders of the organizational mind. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Murk, P.J. (1988). The ideal community educator. Community Education Journal, XV (4), 7-8.

Otterbourg, S., & Timpane, M. (1986). Partnerships and schools. In P. Davis (Ed.) Public-private partnerships: Improving urban life (pp. 60-74). New York: The Academy of Political Science.

Padak, N.D., Peck, J.K., Bothwick, A.G., & Shaklee, B.D. (1993). The development of effective partnerships: Perceptions from the community, the schools and the university. Community Education Journal, Spring, 7-12.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pennington, F.C., & Green, J. (1976). Comparative analysis of program development process in six professions. Adult Education, 27, 13-23.

Reynolds, P.D. (1979). Ethical dilemmas and social science research. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Rolzinski, C.A, & Charner, I. (1987). Improving practice: Lessons from case studies. New Directions for Continuing Education, 33, 75-85.

Sarason, S.B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A.L. (1973). Field research strategies for natural sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Senge, P. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.

Schon, D.A. (1983). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Simerley, R.G. & Associates. (1987). Strategic planning and leadership in continuing education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Simon, R.I. (1992). Teaching against the grain: Texts for a pedagogy of possibility. Toronto, ON: OISE Press.

Smith, M. (1992). The possibilities of public life: Educating in the community. In G. Allen & I. Martin (Eds.), Education and community: The politics of practice (pp. 105-117). New York: Cassell.

Sork, T.J., & Cafferella, R.S. (1989). Planning programs for adults. In S.B. Merriam & P. M. Cunningham (Eds.), Handbook of adult and continuing education. San Franscisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sork, T.J., & Buskey, J.H. (1986). A descriptive and evaluative analysis of program planning literature, 1950-1983. Adult Education Quarterly, 36, 86-96.

Sork, T.J. (1983). Programming in continuing professional education: A comparative analysis of approaches to planning. Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education, 9 (2), 48-57.

Stake, R. E. (1983). Program evaluation particularly responsive evaluation. In G.F. Madaus, M.S. Scriven, & D.K. Stuffelbeam (Eds.), Evaluation models (pp. 287-310). Boston, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Strother, G.B., & Klus, J.P. (1982). Administration of continuing education. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Titmus, C. (1989). (Ed.). Lifelong education for adults: an international handbook. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Thompson, V.A. (1969). Bureaucracy and innovation. Mobile, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Valentine, T. (1984). The consequences of mismanaged interagency collaborations. New Directions for Continuing Education, 53, 65-83.

Votruba, J.C. (Ed.). (1981). Strengthening internal support for continuing education. New Directions for Continuing Education, 9, San Franscisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Walker, S. (1979). Schooling, ideology and the curriculum. London: Falmer Press.

Ward, K., & Taylor, R. (Eds.). (1986). Adult education and the working class. London, EN: Croon Helm.

Warren, R., & Lyon, L. (Eds.). (1988). New perspectives on the American community. Chicago, IL: Dorsey.

Wear, D., & Cook, D. (1986). Community education: The need for a sound theoretical base. Community Education Journal, XIII (13), 19-20.

White, S.W. (1980). A proposed relational understanding between adult and community education. Yearbook of Adult and Continuing Education 1979/80, 351-365.

Wright, J. (1980). Community learning: A frontier in adult education. In R. Boyd, J. Apps and Associates. Redefining the discipline of adult education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Yin, R.K. (1984). Case study research. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Appendix A

Characters in Case Study

Anne	-manager, community education programs Community College
Amy	-administrator, community education programs Community College
Ben	-provincial government consultant (3rd) -ex-officio member, program advisory committee
Beth	-administrator, Community College
Bill	-university professor (second languages) -taught course for heritage language instructors through university -member, program advisory committee
Bob	-executive member of LINGA -instructor, Heritage Language Instructor Training program -member, program advisory committee
Brian	-administrator, Community College
Cathy	-graduate, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Cynthia	-member, program advisory committee
Debra	-graduate, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Don	-member, program advisory committee
Donna	-graduate, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Eileen	-graduate, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Eva	-graduate, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Faye	-graduate, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Frances	-government consultant, second languages
Janet	-president of LINGA

	-instructor, Heritage Language Instructor Training program -chair, program advisory committee
Jill	-executive assistant for LINGA (2nd) -ex-officio member, program advisory committee -graduate of Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Jim	-graduate, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Joan	-curriculum developer and lead instructor, Heritage Language Instructor Training program -ex-officio member, program advisory committee
Joe	-administrator, multicultural programs at Community College -member, program advisory committee
John	-provincial government consultant (2nd) -ex-officio member, program advisory committee
Judy	-executive assistant for LINGA (1st) -ex-officio member, program advisory committee -student, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Karen	-provincial government consultant (1st) -ex-officio member, program advisory committee
Kate	-DACUM workshop facilitator -instructor, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Ken	-federal government consultant -ex-officio member, program advisory committee
Kevin	-government consultant, second languages
Lilly	-graduate, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
LINGA	-non-profit organization to promote heritage language education in northern region of province
Liz	-administrator, Community College
Lynn	-consultant who conducted survey of heritage language schools for provincial government

Maria	-graduate, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Mary	-executive member of LINGA -member, program advisory committee
Michele	-graduate, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Pam	-provincial government consultant (5th) -ex-officio member, program advisory committee
Paul	-government consultant, second languages -member of program advisory committee
Sara	-graduate, Heritage Language Instructor Training program
Sue	-provincial government consultant (4th) -ex-officio member, program advisory committee
Tim	-executive member of LINGA -vice-chair, program advisory committee
Tina	-faculty member, university in south of province
TINGA	-non-profit organization to promote heritage language education in southern part of province
Wendy	-administrator, community education programs at Community College -instructor, Heritage Language Instructor Training program -researcher

Appendix B

Interview Guides

Learner Interview Guide

1. What is your definition of heritage language education?
2. What role does heritage language education play in relation to national and provincial policies concerning multiculturalism?
3. What factors or situations might have influenced the decision to develop a Heritage Language Instructor Training program?
4. What factors and/or situations have influenced the implementation of the program?
5. How have the economic, political, and social environments influenced heritage language education?
6. Who do you think are the stakeholders in heritage language education?
7. As a stakeholder do you feel that you were sufficiently involved throughout the design and implementation of the program?
8. Who do you think should be involved in the design and delivery of heritage language education?
9. How long have you been teaching your heritage language?
10. What benefits/satisfaction do you achieve as a heritage language instructor? What frustrations do you experience?
11. Why did you decide to participate in the Heritage Language Instructor Training program?
12. What expectations did you have when you commenced the program?
13. Were your expectations concerning your learning met?
14. What challenges did you face as a learner?
15. How has your learning influenced your behavior as a heritage language instructor?

16. How has your learning influenced you personally?

17. What elements do you consider essential in the design of a program to train/prepare heritage language instructors?

18. What aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program would you consider to be beneficial and/or successful?

19. What aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program would you consider require improvement?

20. In your opinion what is the future of heritage language education in Alberta and Canada?

Note: The one learner who was also a member of the program advisory committee was also asked questions listed in this interview guide.

Instructor Interview Guide

1. Why were you interested in teaching in this program?

2. Highlight your experience as a heritage language instructor.

3. As you prepared to teach your first class what were your expectations of the learners?

4. What overall goals did you set for the course you taught?

5. Did you accomplish these goals?

6. What alterations did you make to your curriculum compared to your plan?

7. Why did you make these alterations?

8. What surprises or confirmations did you experience with respect to the learners?

9. What changes did you see take place in the learners?

10. How do you think the course benefitted the learners?

11. If you taught this course again what would you do differently?

Note: Instructors who were also administrators or members of the program advisory committee were also asked the questions listed in these interview guides.

Advisory Committee Interview Guide

1. What is your definition of heritage language education?
2. What role does heritage language education play in relation to national and provincial policies concerning multiculturalism?
3. What factors or situations might have influenced the decision to develop a Heritage Language Instructor Training program?
4. What factors and/or situations have influenced the implementation of the program?
5. How have the economic, political, and social environments influenced heritage language education?
6. Who do you think are the stakeholders in heritage language education?
7. Why do you think you were selected to be a member of the program advisory committee?
8. How do you define your role on the advisory committee?
9. How effectively do you think the committee members worked together?
10. Who should be involved in the design and delivery of heritage language education?
11. What elements do you consider important to include in a curriculum to prepare heritage language instructors?
12. What aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program would you consider to be beneficial and/or successful?
13. What aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program would you consider require improvement?
14. What would you identify as consequences for LINGA in taking on this project?

15. What factors contributed to/or interfered with the development of a cooperative working relationship between the stakeholders?

16. What do you see for the future of heritage language education in Canada and Alberta?

Consultant Interview Guide

1. What is your definition of heritage language education?

2. What role does heritage language education play in relation to national and provincial policies concerning multiculturalism?

3. What factors or situations might have influenced the decision to develop a Heritage Language Instructor Training program?

4. What factors and/or situations have influenced the implementation of the program?

5. How have the economic, political, and social environments influenced heritage language education?

6. Who do you think are the stakeholders in heritage language education?

7. Do you think the stakeholders worked effectively together on this project?

8. How do you define your role as a consultant when working on projects with multiple partners?

9. How effectively do you think this role works?

10. Who should be involved in the design and delivery of heritage language education?

11. What elements do you consider important to include in a curriculum to prepare heritage language instructors?

12. What aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program would you consider to be beneficial and/or successful?

13. What aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program would you consider require improvement?

14. What would you identify as consequences for LINGA in taking on this project?

15. What factors contributed to/or interfered with the development of a cooperative working relationship between the stakeholders?

16. What do you see for the future of heritage language education in Canada and Alberta?

Note: If the consultants were members of the program advisory committee they were asked questions 8 and 9 from the advisory committee interview guide.

Administrator Interview Guide

1. What is your definition of heritage language education?

2. What role does heritage language education play in relation to national and provincial policies concerning multiculturalism?

3. What factors or situations might have influenced the decision to develop a Heritage Language Instructor Training program?

4. What factors and/or situations have influenced the implementation of the program?

5. How have the economic, political, and social environments influenced heritage language education?

6. Who do you think are the stakeholders in heritage language education?

7. Do you think the stakeholders worked together effectively on this project?

8. How do you define your role as an administrator when working on projects with multiple partners?

9. How effectively do you think this role works?

10. Who should be involved in the design and delivery of heritage language education?

11. What elements do you consider important to include in a curriculum to prepare heritage language instructors?

12. What aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program would you consider to be beneficial and/or successful?

13. What aspects of the Heritage Language Instructor Training program

would you consider require improvement?

14. What would you identify as consequences for LINGA in taking on this project?

15. What factors contributed to/or interfered with the development of a cooperative working relationship between the stakeholders?

16. What do you see for the future of heritage language education in Canada and Alberta?

Appendix C

Informed Consent Document

I,__________________, agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Wendy Doughty concerning the Heritage Language Instructor Training program.

Ms. Doughty has advised me that the information which I provide may be used, in whole or in part, in the publication of her doctoral research. I have agreed to participate in this study of my own free will - under the condition that I am not referred to by name, but rather identified as a learner/instructor/advisory committee member/consultant/administrator.

Ms. Doughty has fully advised me of the purpose of the study and that I reserve the right to not respond to any of the interview questions, or to terminate the interview at my discretion.

Signed the ____ day of ______________, 199_

____Interviewee

____Witness

Appendix D

Timeline of Events

October 1987	-initial discussions between LINGA and College
January 1988	-preliminary work on program proposal
August 1988	-program proposal drafted
October 1988	-consultant indicates proposal is premature
March 1989	-program proposals submitted to two funders
June 1989	-inaugural advisory committee meeting
September 1989	-curriculum developer hired
November 1989	-DACUM workshop held
February 1990	-monies from provincial government outstanding
March 1990	-first course is offered
June 1990	-accusations of stolen curriculum
August 1990	-deadline for draft curriculum syllabus -auditor expresses concern about provincial funds not yet received
January 1991	-draft of curriculum syllabus is completed (minus student materials
October 1991	-proposal to broker courses through TINGA -student materials component of syllabus submitted
May 1992	-monies outstanding since March 1989 are received
September 1992	-graduation of first student cohort
January 1993	-continued discussions with TINGA re brokering of program
December 1993	-discussion of future of program

Appendix E

Heritage Language Instructor Training Program
Terms of Reference - Advisory Committee

Members are nominated from organizations, agencies or institutions which have been in the past or are now involved in Heritage Language delivery, in the Province of Alberta. The members are nominated because of their individual expertise and knowledge and their ability to represent a particular constituency.

These abilities, contacts, awareness, and experience are all vital and essential to the ongoing development of the Heritage Language Instructor Training Program at Community College.

The main functions of the advisory committee are to:

1. Ensure that the programming offered by Community College is consistent with standards as set out in the approved proposal.
2. Provide a continuing appraisal of the project from the perspective of the constituency the committee member represents.
3. Provide a forum for coordination between those persons and groups who have a vital interest in the development of the Heritage Language Instructor Training Program at Community College.
4. Provide an opportunity for the exchange of ideas for new directions and possibilities for the Heritage Language Instructor Training Program and its organization at Community College. This exchange will take place in the context of the historical development of such programming in the province in view of the experience of the members.

Frequency of Meetings - 3 times per year.
Duration of Meeting - 2 hours
Roles of Participants - Chairman, Vice Chairman - appointed by committee members

Chairman - assists in setting agenda (not college staff)
- chairs meetings
Vice-Chairman - acts as chairman in his/her absence (not college staff)
Recording Secretary - GMCC staff members
- records minutes, prepares agenda and ensures that committee members receive it

Term of Appointment - 2 years with Chairman changing after 1 year

Appendix F

DACUM Chart - Heritage Language Instructor

Communicate in the Heritage Language A	Speak the heritage language fluently A1	Write in the heritage language A2	Use idiomatic expressions A3	Recognize standard usage of heritage language grammar A4
	Recognize factors that interfere with maintaining heritage language A5	Be aware of dialects A6		
Develop Culture and Traditions B	Plan traditional cultural events B1	Plan special occasions & celebrations B2	Discuss value systems B3	Explain symbols and gestures B4
	Tell stories and poems B5	Sing songs B6	Explain traditional dress B7	Demonstrate culinary practices B8
	Recite prayers B9			
Define Parent Involvement C	Encourage language use at home C1	Clarify parent expectations C2	Explain to parents the school's expectations C3	Identify parental roles within the school C4
	Identify parental roles outside the school C5	Use strategies to work with parents C6		

Develop Classroom Materials D	Find instructional materials D1	Find literature books D2	Select print materials D3	Select audio/video materials D4
	Select textbooks D5	Adapt materials D6	Write instructional materials D7	Produce instructional materials D8
	Record audio and video tapes D9			
Demonstrate Teaching Skills E	Respect children E1	Speak clearly E2	Use motivational techniques E3	Persevere E4
	Solve problems E5	Make decisions E6	Resolve conflict E7	Develop listening skills E8
Use Instructional Methods F	Plan multiple & varied activities F1	Devise repetition and reinforcement activities F2	Implement comprehension strategies F3	Implement speaking techniques F4
	Implement listening techniques F5	Implement reading techniques F6	Implement writing techniques F7	Teach with games, songs and dramatization F8
	Implement student questioning strategies F9	Develop student grouping techniques F10	Implement peer teaching strategies (pair students) F11	Organize guest speakers/resource people F12
	Plan field trips F13	Assign homework F14		

Manage the Classroom G	Arrange classroom spaces G1	Manage class time G2	Establish classroom rules G3	Group students for learning activities G4
	Give students direction & instructions G5	Discipline student behaviour G6	Supervise recess G7	Operate classroom AV equipment G8
	Supervise field trips G9			

Evaluate Students H	Establish standards for evaluation H1	Assess level of ability for placement H2	Assess skills informally H3	Assess skills formally H4
	Assess class participation H5	Assess student attitude H6	Recognize student effort through awards H7	Recognize student achievement through awards H8
	Assign grades H9	Assign high school credits H10	Prepare report cards H11	Prepare cumulative student records H12

Plan the Program I	Determine length of program I1	Set program objectives I2	Develop 'long term' program plan I3	Sequence curriculum I4
	Prepare curriculum I5	Write lessons I6	Schedule daily class activities I7	Plan activities to meet individual student needs I8
	Assess daily or weekly lessons I9	Evaluate program effectiveness I10		

Administration J	Recruit students J1	Recruit teachers J2	Acquire facilities J3	Determine class size and levels J4
	Prepare and monitor budget J5	Raise funds J6	Set registration fees J7	Orient new teachers J8
	Arrange for teacher training J9	Recruit and organize volunteers J10	Provide letters of reference for volunteers J11	Provide feedback to teachers J12
	Recognize contribution of teachers J13	Establish and maintain library J14	Keep attendance records J15	Maintain student records J16

Appendix G

Course Curriculum

Heritage Language Instructor Training Program

The Heritage Language Instructor Training program is a series of non-credit courses developed specifically for community-based heritage language instructors. The curriculum consists of ten courses (120 hours of instruction) in the form of eight compulsory and a choice of two elective courses.

These courses have been developed based on a DACUM profile which identified 10 major skill areas and 96 specific competencies required by a successful heritage language instructor. The courses are designed for active heritage language instructors, particularly those who have received limited teacher training.

Students are awarded a letter indicating their successful completion of each course. Upon successful completion of all 10 courses, the participant is issued a Certificate of Completion from Community College.

The courses included in the curriculum syllabus are:

Compulsory Courses

Developing Course Materials **9 hours**
This course is designed to help Heritage Language instructors to identify, adapt, and design appropriate classroom materials.

Instruction and Classroom Management **18 hours**
This course is designed to help Heritage Language instructors to develop successful instructional strategies and manage classroom activities and behavior. Topics covered include learning styles, cooperative learning, individualized instruction, group learning activities and motivating learners. Participants will design a variety of activities and materials for use in the classroom.

Developing Comprehension-Listening and Speaking **12 hours**
The development of listening and speaking skills is a key element in heritage language instruction. This course will present ways to assess oral/aural fluency, effective methods to teach listening and speaking skills, using audiovisual materials to reinforce learning as well as drama, music, and puppetry as learning aids.

Developing Reading and Writing Skills 12 hours
Topics included in the course are developmental models for reading and writing, assessing reading and writing abilities, selecting and developing learning materials, and developing material collections. Emphasis will be placed on developing materials to be used in the heritage language classroom.

Integrating Language and Culture 6 hours
This course will address the benefits and challenges of incorporating cultural materials in the language learning classroom. Topics will include how to identify and integrate cultural elements into the curriculum, the role of ethnography, language learning and how to place cultural events in the appropriate context.

Questioning Strategies 12 hours
Topics in the course include developing and using specialized questioning strategies and distinguishing questions appropriate to literature, non-fiction and oral settings. You will also become familiar with Bloom's Taxonomy and develop creative and critical thinking skills.

Lesson Planning 15 hours
Topics in this course include, criteria for a good lesson, using student groups, writing instructional goals and objectives, plus preparing to create a curriculum.

Evaluation 15 hours
In this course you will learn to assess second language competency using formal and informal testing. You will also become familiar with various methods of recording and communicating student progress.

Elective Courses

Using Audiovisual Materials 9 hours
This course is designed to help Heritage Language instructors to learn about a variety of audio-visual equipment that may be available for classroom use, and how to use it for heritage language instruction. An audiovisual aide will be developed including visual elements and sound.

Working with Advanced Students 9 hours
Advanced level students create a challenge for many heritage language instructors. Learn how to assess the abilities of such students and techniques to maintain language fluency. Participants will design a variety of learner activities for advanced students.

Oral and Written Games 9 hours
In this course you will learn to recognize the importance of games for language

development and motivation, identify oral and written games appropriate for various levels of learners and be able to successfully implement them in the classroom.

Administrative Issues **9 hours**

This course will address the issues involved in operating a Heritage Language School. Topics to be covered included establishing school objectives, parent and community roles, recruiting and supervising instructors plus budget management, fund raising and legal concerns.

Appendix H

Schedule of Advisory Committee Meetings

The proposed schedule of Heritage Language Instructor Training program advisory committee meetings was as follows:

1990 - 3 meetings
March
May
November

1991 - 3 meetings
February
May
October

1992 - 2 meetings
January
March

The actual schedule of meetings was as follows:
1989 - 2 meetings
June 7, 1989
July 10, 1989 (cancelled due to lack of quorum)
September 29, 1989 (cancelled due to lack of quorum)
October 20, 1989
-meeting to be called for January

1990 - 3 meetings
March 23, 1990
June 28, 1990
November 30, 1990

1991 - 1 meeting
-date for next meeting to be determined in January, 1991
October 25, 1991

1992 - 1 meeting
January 31, 1992 (cancelled due to lack of agenda)
April 3, 1992
-next meeting to be called by chair

No further advisory committee meetings beyond April 3, 1992.